AL-FARABI KAZAKH NATIONAL UNIVERSITY

Zh. B. Kundakbayeva

THE HISTORY OF KAZAKHSTAN FROM THE EARLIEST PERIOD TO THE PRESENT TIME

VOLUME I
From the earliest period to 1991

Educational manual

Almaty
«Qazaq university»
2016

UDK 94 (574)
K 92

Recommended for publication by the Academic Council of the al-Faraby Kazakh National University's History, Ethnology and Archeology Faculty and the decision of the Editorial-Publishing Council (Protocol №1 dated by 02.11.2016)

Reviewers:
doctor of historical sciences, professor ***G. Dadabayeva***
doctor of historical sciences, ***B. Zhanguttin***
doctor of historical sciences, professor ***G. Habizhanova***

Kundakbayeva Zh.B.

K 92 The History of Kazakhstan from the Earliest Period to the Present time. Volume I. From the Earliest period to 1991: educational manual / Zh.B. Kundakbayeva. – Almaty: Qazaq university, 2016. – 326 p.

ISBN 978-601-2107-3

The first volume of the History of Kazakhstan for the students of non-historical specialties has provided with extensive materials on the history of the present-day territory of Kazakhstan from the earliest period to 1991. Here found the reflection both recent developments on Kazakhstan history studies, primary sources evidences, teaching materials, control questions that help students understand better the course. Many of the disputable issues of the times are given in the historiographical view.

The textbook is designed for students, teachers, undergraduates, and everybody, who is interested in the history of Kazakhstan.

Publishing in authorial release.

Первый том Истории Казахстана для студентов неисторических специальностей содержит богатый материал по историческому прошлого на территории современного Казахстана с древнейших времен до 1991 года. В учебном пособии отражены как последние достижения казахстанской исторической науки, источниковедения, так и учебный материал и контрольные вопросы, которые помогут студентам лучше усвоить курс. Многие дискуссионные проблемы представлены в историографическом ключе. Учебное пособие предназначено для студентов, преподавателей, студентов-бакалавров и всех тех, кто интересуется историей Казахстана.

Издается в авторской редакции.

UDK 94 (574)

© Kundakbayeva Zh.B., 2016
© Al-Faraby KazNU, 2016

ISBN 978-601-2107-3

INTRODUCTION

This textbook is intended to be a generally understandable and clearly organized outline of historical processes which took place on the present day territory of Kazakhstan since pre-historic time. It consists of two parts. In the first part in chronological sequence is told about historical processes since ancient times till getting independence in 1991. In the second part main attention would be given to the contemporary history of Kazakhstan.

The existing works on Kazakhstan's history usually stress the evolution of the statehood on the territory of Kazakhstan. A number of important general histories emphasize that Kazakh people have a millennia-long history. Although some other works do not contain a harsh critique of the Soviet regime nonetheless leaving aside certain positive outcomes such as industrialization, educational progress and national delimitation. Most of already published books offer idea of Kazakh people struggle for their independence for centuries. At the same time in works of Western and Russian authors is advanced the idea that ancient population of the Kazakhstan might have either no very little connection with the modern Kazakh ethnic group. Another principal distinction of the textbook is that it avoids getting the evidences and points, giving comprehensive explanation. On the contrary, it makes students to ask and and to answer the questions themselves. Control questions required students to interpret, to imagine and to rationalize the possible answers because the answers could not be found in the textbook.

In the basis of the textbook underlines the idea that the historical past of Kazakhstan was a complex mix of continuity and change. On the basis of the outside forces that caused dramatic changes have been distinguished patterns of the past. The first pattern is the genesis of nomadism. In early Iron Age the entire population of the Eurasian steppes passed to the nomadic mode of reproduction as a main

occupation. It was caused by climatic change in Early Iron epoch. At the same time nomadism defined basic elements of the Kazakh ethnic culture – a way of thinking about the world around oneself, about circles of life, which have reached right up to the present day.

The second pattern is Turkic epoch. The rise and decline of Turkic empires in Eurasian steppes influenced on changing the anthropological appearance of the Eurasian steppes inhabitants, defined the map of settling tribes, and also the linguistic map of the region. In that epoch did formed basic elements of the Turks 'spiritual culture – the Turkic form of Tengrism and the ancestors' cult exist up till now. The next large change happened in the Mongol epoch. The Mongol conquest caused large migrations of the population, what in the end hastened ethnic consolidation processes, and forming ethno political structures on the territory of Kazakhstan completed with establishing the first Kazakh state – the Kazakh Khanate. The fourth pattern can be distinguished with coming the Russian Empire. That was the period when were transformed traditional institutions of power, social structure, began modernization. The largest changes took place in the Soviet epoch when was forcibly broken nomadism, the populations centuries-old way of life, was inculcated the Marxist-Leninist ideology which transformed the people's consciousness. At the same time the Soviet epoch became the time of the rapid modernization, gathering Kazakh land within the framework of the Soviet Republic, legal consolidation of the territory, what subsequently became the base of the modern territory of the Republic of Kazakhstan.

In the textbook is considered the following circle of problems:

Genesis of nomadism in the Eurasian steppes.

Main traits of the Turk epoch which subsequently became basic components of the Kazakh's culture up till now.

Ethnic processes on the territory of Kazakhstan which completed with the formation of the Kazakh.

Configuration of the political infrastructure on the territory of Kazakhstan before its destruction by Russian Empire.

Historiographical views from the XIX century till today of the Russian Empire's policy toward Kazakhstan.

P;uralistic view on the Soviet epoch and to the characteristics of the Soviet State.

The aim of the textbook is to develop of historical thinking skills while leaning historical content:

The ability to identify, compare and evaluate multiple perspectives on a given historical event in order to draw conclusions about that event.

The ability to connect historical events and processes to specific circumstances of time and place as well as broader regional, national or global processes.

The ability to recognize, analyze and evaluate the dynamics of historical continuity and change over periods of time of varying length as well as the ability to relate these patterns to larger historical processes.

The ability to identify, analyze and evaluate the relationships among historical causes and effects, distinguishing between those that are long term and proximate.

Thus, in the textbook is realized the idea, that studying the past is far more engaging than memorizing dates. Textbook was designed to engage students in their own learning of history, to assist them in developing historical thinking competencies, but not simply understanding of the chronological sequence of events on the territory of Kazakhstan or an uncritical, history-as-true-fact, spoon-fed-hero-worshipping of and the unquestioned glorification of some person in the past.

In the realization of the given aim will help not only texts of the chapters, but also the rich didactic material. After each section are offered control questions. These questions required students to interpret, to imagine and to rationalize the possible answers because the answers could not be found in the textbook. Finally such skills will help student to understand the historical facts in relation to today's and future's events. When students have acquired the ability to think historically, they able to understand the meaning of the past actions and events, and able to relate, explain and predict the present and future activities emphasized on understanding the chronology of the historical events.

I Part

KAZAKHSTAN LANDS INHABITANTS IN EARLIEST PERIOD

1.1. The Stone Age archeological sites on the territory of Kazakhstan

The beginning of human history has been reconstructed entirely through archaeological material – artefacts of daily use, tools and weapons, pots and pans, toys and playthings, dress and ornaments, furniture and fabrications of all sorts, objects of and for worship as well as many other items that constitute human culture or cultures. So, archeological sources are very important for reconstructing the periods when the written sources did not emerge Archeologists use their own periodization. The names for archaeological periods in the list of archaeological periods vary enormously from region to region. Dating also varies considerably across wide areas. The three-age system has been used in many areas, referring to the prehistorical periods identified by tool manufacture and use, of the Stone Age, the Bronze Age and the Iron Age. Since these ages are distinguished by the development of technology, it is natural that the dates, to which these refer, vary in different parts of the world. So, according to this periodization system the Stone Age is divided into the Paleolithic era, the Mesolithic era and the Neolithic Era. As Jeremy Tredinnick mentioned, Kazakhstan's role in the history of mankind is significant, if to look at the history of settling the earth by first humans. Jeremy Tredinnick emphasizes that although there are many theories about when, in what way and where the first humans moved out of Africa, there is solid archaeological evidence that the ancestors (Homo habilis, Homo Erectus, Homo Neanderthalensis

and Homo Sapiens) migrated from the Middle East to Central Asia and stayed here. According to Jeremy Tredinnick: «Modern-day genome Controling has subsequently shown that the colonization by humans of both northern Europe and Siberia- and from there North America – began in Central Asia and of territory of Kazakhstan»[1].

When the first hominids had settled on the coast of the Caspian Sea and the ridges of Karatau, Central Asia was a hot, humid savanna under the influence of a monsoonal climate from the south. Therefore, the first people settled near water sources. As soon as the tectonic movements in the **Tien Shan** resulted in the state of Mountains, the climate had changed. In the conditions of changes in the monsoons and cyclones, increasing continental climate in the arid zone, a considerable part of the Kazakhstan territory was desertificated.

Different regions of Kazakhstan in these changing conditions differently responded to these changes. Thus, the Caspian and Turan desert regions are characterized by stability of paleographic conditions. The region is characterized by a favorable climate, an abundance of hunting places and habitats, availability of fresh water. Therefore, on the coast of the Caspian Sea and the Ustyurt plateau remained numerous sites of the Stone Age.

Also, the Sary-Arka region, with a combination of small hills and plains was had been for a long time the area of primitive people habitat. But with coming of many years frozen conditions of the ground hominids left the habitat. The next hominid dispersal region is the southeast Karatau range, which climatically had exceptionally favorable conditions. The geological structure of the mountains also favourated the continuous habitation here large herds of animals. Therefore the Karatau range had been a favorite place for settling ancient hominids, who found here food and water sources. So, of the most interest are the early Paleolithic sites Borykazgan and Tanirkazgan. Here were found a wide range of heavily abraded flakes and cores, mostly irregular orthogonal cores, core-like products and modified flakes, but also bilateral chopping tools.

[1] Jeremy Tredinnick. Pre-history: Human migrations and the the stone age // See: Tredinnick J. An illustrated History of Kazakhstan: Asia's Heartland in Context. Published by Odyssey Books & Maps. 2014. – P. 20.

Epipaleolithic (the transitional period from Early to Late Paleolithic) sites were discovered also in central Kazakhstan. For example, Kudaykol site with finely flaked blades, often with new technical developments like retouched backs. The Northern Pre-Balkhash area was also the settlement area in the Paleolithic era. In this area sites were found on river and lake terraces, on the tops and slopes of hills. So, at Semizbugu site in Zhezkazgan were stored a collection of stone objects in 1611 units. In East Kazakhstan the most ancient is the Kozybai site. As regards the Upper Paleolithic era in Kazakhstan there are no many completely studied sites. The most complete material for this period are the findings of stone objects at the Karatau range in Southern Kazakhstan, on the Irtysh River in Eastern Kazakhstan, in the Sarysu River in Northern Balkhash area.

The Mesolithic period on the territory of Kazakhstan is poorly studied. Today well studied and documented only about two tens Mesolithic sites in Kazakhstan. Mesolithic sites were found there where up till now have not been discovered Paleolithic ones. As a rule, sites located on the banks of rivers and lakes. Remains of housing constructions have not survived. During the Mesolithic period the climate had changed in the first place it was connected with the retreat of glaciers. At that time, formed the hydrographic network, close to the modern, formed the flora and fauna composition close to the modern. Because of the extinction of mammoths, there were going ways to provide the means of subsistence. During the Mesolithic period widely spread use of bows and arrows, bush techniques for making tools, increased mobility of the population. The most important invention of the Mesolithic epoch was the bow. It was stipulated with transition to individual hunting. In the Mesolithic there was also a further fundamental change in the technique of making tools – their size did not depend on the size of the stone. It was possible thanks bush technique what became the basis for making various tools. The most widespread tools became arrowheads, tips of darts, javelins and spears, scrapers for processing skins, hides, knives. Complexes with material remnants of Mesolithic sites do not show significant differences from the sites of the Southern Urals, Western Siberia and the Eastern Caspian region. The heyday of stone processing technique became

the Neolithic period. At this time, there more and more was increasing specialization in making tools. Along with the improvement of pressure retouch technology, appeared new technological stone processing methods: grinding, drilling, sawing, began making stone axes, hoes, grinding stones, mortars, pestles. Currently in Kazakhstan there are discovered more than 800 Neolithic and Eneolithic sites. They are divided into four types: Spring, river, lake and cave. At sited of the lake and river types there are a significant quantity of findings. But the most widespread on the territory of Kazakhstan are spring sites, as arid and semi-arid zones are poor with a river network. Sites at the springs are often temporary and seasonal. One of the features of the Neolithic sites in Kazakhstan is in the fact that most of them are sites of the open type. Neolithic sites of Kazakhstan form several territorial groups. The most important feature of the Neolithic period is the transition from appropriating economy with gathering and hunting to the producing economy with the emergence of animal husbandry and agriculture. But in Kazakhstan, as the findings show, the transition was not so noticeable. As before hunting and fishing were the main sources of food. Obviously, continental climate did not favour the growth of population and there were natural resources enough to meet the needs of the population. Thus, in the Neolithic producing forms of economy on the territory of Kazakhstan did not nave their spreading. The most studied archaeological cultures of the Neolithic period on the territory of Kazakhstan are Atbasar and Mahandzhar culture. The Atbasar culture got its name on the place of the greaControl concentration of sites – The Atbasar area of the Akmola region. Here were surveyed about 200 sites, 20 of them have been excavated. The Mahanzhar culture is located on the bottom of the Turgai gully. Characteristic for this culture topography of sites is the location of the broad plots of the flood lands in the place where the river gets sharply narrow. Almost on all the sites the cultural layer consists of sand and sandy loam and in a large part has been dispelled. The Mahandzhar culture had a characteristic feature – presence of the original dishes. It was thin-walled ceramic tableware, hand-made and having elongate proportions. On the territory of Kazakhstan for the time have been discovered a few Neolithic burials, mostly in Northern Kazakhstan.

None of the burials has external signs on the surface. In all the graves there were arrowheads, in the burials there was no much ceramics. As for the next stage of the archaeological periodization Eneolithic (the epoch of brass instruments introduction to people's life), in Kazakhstan stone industry not degraded, but rose to a higher level. Possibilities on stone processing not only had been implemented to the maximum, but there also was extended the range of production and household equipment. The most striking culture of the Eneolithic epoch is the Botai culture in Kokshetau oblast. In 1980, discovery of Botai settlement by the Kazakh archaeologist V.F. Zaybertom became a major event in the study of the Eneolithic era in Kazakhstan. European scientists have confirmed that just here the horse was first domesticated. The site is located on the right bank of the Iman-Burluk river, five km to the south of the Botai junction of the Volodarsky Area of the Kokshetau oblast. The area of the settlement was one hundred twenty thousand sq. km. On the surface were clearly fixed contours of eighty dwellings, the total capacity of the cultural layer, including housing depressions, reached from one point to two meters. Were found about sixty thousand objects made of stone, clay, bone. In the settlement in a large number were found animal bones, most of which, according to L.A.Ermolova, belonged to horses. Also were found bones of bison, aurochs, deer, elks, wolves-dogs, bears, beavers, etc. Stationary excavations at the Botai settlement also continued in subsequent years. During this time (5 years) was found quite informative material. The site industry had a flake character. The presence of various types of tools, their high range was evidence of a diversified economy. In the process of excavation was received large osteological material – about 25 thousand horse bones. Under the excavations it became clear that the settlement was stationary and functioned 300-400 years. Materials of the Botai settlement allowed the author to distinquish a separate Botai cultural type, which spread over a large territory of Northern Kazakhstan. The excavations have shown that they were buildings in the last stage of the settlement existence. So it can be concerned that the Botai is the settlement where the earliest horse domestication has been documented. Thus, the Botai culture marked the type of a community where emerged a new form of economy - mobile cattle-breeding.

Control questions:

1. Which of the regions of Kazakhstan became «a favorite place for settling by primitive people with the coming of many years frozen conditions of the ground»? Provide some information to explain why.
2. What are the features of the Neolithic epoch on the territory of Kazakhstan?
3. Give arguments in favor of the discovery by I. Saibert that the Neolithic Botai settlement is a major event in the archeology of Eurasia.
4. Describe two the most studied archaeological cultures of the Neolithic epoch.
5. Why on the territory of Kazakhstan, do not we see signs of the transition to the appropriating forms of economy in the Neolithic epoch?

Tasks for independent study:

Read **Appendix I** Rogozinskiy Alexei. Rock sites in Kazakhstan // Rock Art in Central Asia. A Thematic study. November. 2011. Ed. by Jean Clottes. UNESCO. International Council on Monuments and Sites. – Paris. 2011. – P.9-43. After reading the paper write a 500 words essay on the following topic: «Give characteristics of the most large and significant location of petroglyphs on the territory of modern Kazakhstan. Prove the statement why they are potential sites for the World Heritage List and are presented in the Tentative List of Kazakhstan for UNESCO or were included in the World Heritage List».

1.2. The Bronze Age Archeological Sites on the Present-Day Kazakhstan territory

At the turn of the first – second quarters of the II millennium B.C. in the Eurasian steppes was invented bronze. Bronze is a copper-tin alloy, sometimes antimony, arsenic, and lead in various proportions depending on the purpose of the product. As compared with copper, it has a number of advantages: differs in hardness, low melting point, a beautiful golden color. Bronze became the main raw material for making tools and weapons.

The tribes living on the territory of Kazakhstan in the Bronze Age, left archaeological sites (settlements, cemeteries, mines, rock paintings) that belong to the Andronov archaeological culture. The name was given to the culture on the place of the first excavations of a burial ground in the Andronov village in Southern Siberia. In 1927, archaeologist M.P. Grjaznov found similar burials in Western

Kazakhstan and established that the Andronov culture sites spread over a wide area - from Minusinsk in the east to the Ural Mountains in the west. Later Andronov monuments have been found in the south of Kazakhstan, in the Semirechye and Central Asia. Thus, in the Bronze Age steppe expanses of Siberia, Ural, Kazakhstan and Central Asia were populated by kinred tribes, that left a bright distinctive culture. In science, it has received the conventional name Andronov. One of the main centers of the Andronov Culture was on the territory of Kazakhstan. Archaeological data evidence that the Andronov population in the overwhelming majority led a sedentary life. Settlements located on the banks of rivers with broad flood plain meadows. Dwellings of big patriarchal families were earth-houses with various household extension and enclosures for cattle. The main occupation of the Andronov population was cattle-breeding and agricultural economy with a evident predominance of pastoralism. Andronov culture had a number of distinctive features. Among them the burial rite was main. The Andronov's burial structures erected in the form of stone fences of different configurations: square, round, oval. The dead were burned or buried on their side in a doubled-up posture in boxes made of stone slabs or rectangular ground chambers. The second distinctive feature of the Andronov Culture was a peculiar set of pottery with geometric designs. Vessels were made by hand. They had a flat bottom. The outer side of the vessels was decorated with complex geometric patterns. The third feature were forms of metal products. For example, they were characterized by decorations in the form of gold leaf earrings, folded in one and a half turn, decorations of head-dresses and clothes in the form of glasses-shaped or palmate pendants, bangles with spirally twisted ends. The Andronov culture belongs to the early and middle stages of the Bronze Age.

Bone material from settlements of the Early Bronze Age suggests that the main occupation was house pastoralism. In herds dominated cattle. There was not many sheep and horses. But gradually, the house pastoralism developed into yaylazhnoe. In the herd increased the proportion of sheep and horses – hardy animals and able to take feed out of the snow. But depending on the geographical factors in some areas began the domesticating wild

animals, in other developed hoe agriculture. Along with agriculture and cattle-breeding an important role played mining of various ores, stone and bones processing. Among the Andronovs were quite developed home trades – producing clothes, footwear, making ceramic tableware, fighting weapons – arrows with bronze tips, spears, maces, axes. In the late Bronze Age on the territory of Kazakhstan appeared another archaeological culture, which on the place of the first findings was called Begazy-Dandybai culture. At an early stage of this culture development was characteristic combination of Andronov's traditions with new elements - a special type of funerary structures, the presence of vessels of a squat, spherical shape. For the Begazy-Dandybai culture was characteristic another burial rite than the Andronov's had. Along with the usual, double-up are met stretched bodies on the back. For this transitional stage as a typical monument is Aksu Ayuly II funerary complex to the south of Karaganda. It consists of the same type earthen mounds, with ring fences of large granite slabs, dug in with their edges. These are not ancestral burials of patriarchal-family communities, but the tombs of the most prominent members of the communities. At this early stage of the Late Bronze Age already appeared human burials in the stretched posture. Pottery had also changed more and more adapting to the mobile life. The rapid growth of livestock heads associated with the transition to yaylazhnyi and then to nomadic pastoralism, was reflected in the funeral rite, when the deceased were buried with meat food. In burial places are found a large numbers of domestic animals bones. To the developed stage of the Begazy-Dandybaш culture belong a number of rich mausoleum-necropoleis: Begazy, Aibas-Daras, Akkoitas, Dandybai, etc. These burial grounds and settlements are characterized by completeness of architectural forms of residential and cultic constructions, a variety of new types of spherical ceramics. At the late stage of developing the Begazy-Dandybai culture the economy was changing to a nomadic way. Complex funeral constructions of the previous time were replaced by simple ones of large stone boxes without fences. The design of the dwellings was also changed constructions of the ground type became dominant. In general, it should be noted that the period of the Late Bronze Age all over the territory of Kazakhstan was characterized by

the transition of pastoral tribes to the nomadic pastoralism. The Bronze Age pastoralists in the steppes completed the transition to various forms of nomadism at the beginning of the first millennium B.C. in the northern areas of Central Asia. This was a fundamental, qualitative leap comparable in its economic, cultural and political consequences with the so-called urban revolution in the settled oases of the southern regions. The wide-scale introduction of metallurgy contributed to the development of specialized branches of manufacture, including weapon-making. The accumulation of wealth and military conflicts led to the institutionalization of power, and tribal leaders developed into absolute petty rulers. On the ideological level, these processes were reflected in the appearance of monumental tombs for these members of the developing élite. Interregional contacts increased sharply, particularly with the acquisition of horse-riding. Spiritual and material values thus spread rapidly over great distances. A striking example of this is provided by the so-called deer-stones decorated with artistic reliefs, which are known over an enormous area from Mongolia to Bulgaria. The transition to nomadism was also responsible for a fundamental change in the mode of life: the armed rider became the symbol of the new period and we encounter its equipment in burials and in the arts. On this foundation powerful groups of early nomadic tribes were formed around the middle of the first millennium B.C. A new force as powerful as the ancient Orient State entities entered into the arena of world history.

Control questions:

1. Give the characteristic of the Andronov culture hallmarks in Kazakhstan.
2. What types of cattle-breeding were developed among the Andronov population? Describe them.
3. Compare the Begazy-Dandybai culture with the Andronov one. Give specific examples.
4. Basing on the archaeological material prove, that at the late stage of the Begazy-Dandybai culture development was changing the economy to a nomadic way.

1.3. The Iron Age on the Kazakhstan territory

1.3.1. The Saka tribes on the Kazakhstan territory: sources evidences

As prominent Kazakhstani archeologist K. Baipakov mentioned, when the first millennium B.C. began the steppes of Central Asia were marked by a number of factors that came together to facilitate a world-changing phenomenon. Firstly, climate changes had led to increasing aridity on the most part of the Kazakhstan territory, forcing the population to engage in nomadic pastoralism. The numerous bone materials found during the excavations evidence about it. In addition, in this period the rite of horse devoting to the dead got its wide spreading, Controlifying to the growing role of the horse in the life of the region ancient inhabitants. Secondly, the transition to nomadic pastoralism coincided with the invention and use of tools made of iron. The tribes living in that epoch, involved in the genesis of nomadic pastoralism were the Sakas. In contrast to the previous stage of the history the Early Iron Age is represented in written sources of ancient Greek, Achaemenid and Chinese origin. For example, there are mentions of Sakas in the Behistun Inscription of Darius I (521-486 B.C.) of Achaemenian Persia as well as Avesta, a set of ancient Iraninan books of the Zoroastrian religion. Some of the information we also find in ancient Greek and Latin sources. The most important among them are data of Herodotus, Xenophon, and latter authors as Arrian, Ptolemy and Strabo. The term 'Tura' is the name by which the Central Asian nomadic tribes were in one of the earliest parts of the Avesta. The Turas are portrayed as enemies of the sedentary Iranians and described as possessing fleet-footed horses. As early as 641 or 640 B.C. the nomads were known in Assyrian sources as the Sakas. Many Greek writers referred to all the nomads of Eurasia, including those of Central Asia, as Scythians; and the Persians designated all the nomadic tribes of the Eurasian steppes, including the Scythians, as the Sakas. These broad classifications were based on the similarity of cultures and ways of life of all the nomads who spoke Iranian languages as the

authors of the second volume of History of Civilizations of Central Asia assert[2]. The question of the actual distribution of the different nomadic tribes or tribal groups is debatable, largely because of the dearth of written sources. Moreover, it is well to remember that nomadic life characteristically entailed frequent migrations, with the result that different tribes successively occupied one and the same territory. When it is considered that these tribes were culturally very close to one another it is easy to understand why classical writers sometimes associated different tribes with the same historical events. The Saka tribes were contemporaries of the Royal Scythians, who lived in the Northern Black Sea and Dnieper region, and the Sauromatians who occupied the lower Volga region and southern Ural. For our territory very representative sources on the history of Saka tribes, their material and spiritual culture are archaeological monuments – mounds, cave paintings, treasures of the Sakas' things. Such monuments discovered by scientists in different regions of Kazakhstan. So, judging by the archaeological findings in the first millennium B.C. Semirechye and South Kazakhstan were the center of settling a large group of Saka tribes, according to one hypothesis identical to the Sakas-Tigraxauda. This region on the accumulation of a large number of royal burial mounds in height more than 20 meters is unrivaled in Central Asia and other regions of Kazakhstan. Unique among them is the Bes-Shatyr burial-ground, which is located on the right bank of the Ili River. It consists of 31 burial mounds, of which twenty one are with stone coverings, and ten with the rubble and earth. Most mounds were plundered. But, nevertheless, they contain valuable archaeological material, the most important of which are new types of monumental structures. In the Saka barrows of the Bes-Shatyr burial ground were discovered perfectly preserved large timbered funeral structures. In 1969-1970 by archaeological expedition headed by K. Akishev was found and excavated another large monument of the Saka epoch – the Kurgan Issyk burial mound consisting of 45 tombs. In one of the mounds with a diameter of sixty meters and a height of six meters under the

[2] History of Civilizations of Central Asia.Volume II: The Development of Sedentary and Nomadic Civilizations: 700 B.C. to A.D. 250 / Edited by Janos Harmatta, B.J. Puri, and G.F. Etemadi – Paris: UNESCO Publishing, 1999. – P. 23.

embankment were discovered two burial places – central and lateral. The central grave had been completely deformed by robbers, the lateral - turned out to be undisturbed. In the southern and western parts of the cell is placed tableware in the northern part was the remains of the deceased. On the bones and underneath there were numerous items of adornments of cloths, a headgear and footwear, made of sheet gold. At the buried in a large number were found items of weapons, toilets and numerous utensils. Thus, the Issyk burial mound contains the richest material about the culture of the Sakas. Besides the so-called royal burial mounds on the territory of Semirechye and South Kazakhstan were found burials of common members of the communities of the Saka time. To them belong the Kargaly I burial ground to the west from Almaty city and Altyn-Emel in the Chulak Mountains. The Eastern Aral Sea region is also rich in discoveries of the Saka time – such as the Uigarak and Tagisken burial mounds in the lower reaches of the Syr Darya. In this more arid desert region bodies were placed on cane mats inside light wooden-framed cells interwoven with twigs and canes. Of the items that have been recovered, plagues covered in golden foil, applique clothing and strings on carnelian, turquoise and chalcedony beads illustrate how the deceased were buried. In the Uygarak men wore earrings and the women bracelets and bronze and iron daggers were placed at the feet of both sexes, as well as horse trappings to initiate actual horse burial. A remarkable monument of the steppe part of Eastern Kazakhstan is Chiliktin mound, which was part of a large burial ground of the fifty-one mounds in the form of an earthen embankment. There are no small mounds. It was a large cemetery of tribal leaders and common leaders functioning for centuries. The Chiliktin mound is one of the oldest in Eurasia. There clearly presented applied arts of the Saka tribes. The later stage of the culture of ancient herdsmen of Eastern Kazakhstan is represented with the Berel mounds. Monuments of this type are represented in the well-known Pazaryk mounds of Eastern Altai. The most important of them is the Berel burial ground at the Bukhtarma River. The Big Berel mound in the northern half is occupied with sixteen horses killed for burying. The seventeenth lies next to the sarcophagus-block. The dead horses were placed on a birch bark

lining in a certain order. Remains of the horse harness have survived on the horses. In the Big Berel mound apparently was buried a tribal leader. His grave is distinguished with wealth and splendor. The Berel mound provided superb examples of the Scitho-Siberian animistic style. The Horse trappings and weapons reflected the military lifestyle and reverence for nature with numerous fascinating sculpted wooden pierces covered with gold or tin foil.

Archeological sites have been founded on the territory of Kazakhstan seemed to demonstrate cultural uniformity throughout the area. Everywhere burials were found in barrows (kurgans) containing similar weapons, horse trappings and works of art. The choice of motifs and their style – known as the 'animal style' – pointed to a uniform cultural pattern. All this helped to give rise to the concept of a single Scythian culture, presented throughout the Eurasian steppes, which had spread from a single Centre and belonged to one tribe or people.

Control questions:

1. Give the characteristics of the Saka tribes archeological data on the territory of Kazakhstan.
2. Give the meaning and origin if the term Tura.
3. What kind of archeological data support the concept of a single Scythian culture presented throughout the Eurasian steppes.

1.3.2. Emergence and evolution of nomadic pastoralism in Eurasian Steppe

The end of the first millennium B.C. and the beginning of our era were a turning point in the history of Kazakhstan. In the economic life of the population of Central Asia and Kazakhstan major changes associated with the invention of iron and the transition to the nomadic way of production. Transition to nomadism allowed humans to settle in the vast expanses. This way of life had existed in the Eurasian steppes for three millennia ahead for many centuries, not only lifestyle, but especially culture. Main factors determining transition to nomadism were physical and climatic conditions and socio-cultural factors. Among scientists, however, there is no consensus about when and why pastoralists in Eurasia passed to

nomadism. Some authors believe that the transition of sedentary nomads to nomadism was stipulated by the necessity of developing new spaces with increasing the cattle number (M.P. Grjaznov, K.A.Akishev, K.M.Baipakov). The whole number of researchers adhere to the climatological concept (K.V. Salnikov, L.N. Gumilyov). L.S. Klein sees the main reason for nomadism in the cattle-breeder's realization of military benefits of the nomadic life. The prominent Kazakh specialist in study of nomadism world renowned N. Massanov considered that G.E Markov's standpoint was more substantiated. G.E. Markov considered that the transition of pastoral tribes to nomadism was driven by a complex of factors – climatogenic, anthropogenic, socio-economic, political, cultural. A direct incitement according to G.E. Markov was changes in the geographical environment where people in the conditions of climate aridity were not able to feed themselves at the expense of the agricultural economy any longer. As for the time of transition to the nomadic life, scientists are unanimous in the fact that it happened at the turn of the II-I millennium B.C. Among the main factors that led to the transition of cattle-breeders to the nomadic way of life - as the dominant way of production should be distinguished primarily by climatic factors. The vast territory of Kazakhstan being located at the junction of different geographical zones differs with variety of geographical and climatic conditions and is characterized by a number of special features and properties. Geophysically Kazakhstan is mostly a low-mountain plain with vast flat lowlands, elevated plateaus and low-mountain massifs. The southern and south-eastern part is mountainous regions with snowy peaks. The relief features and atmospheric precipitation in combination with other geographical factors determined the hydrographic regime in Kazakhstan. The main part of the water resources is in a field of internal drainage and only the northern part – a wastewater basin (basins of the Irtysh, Ishim, Tobol rivers). Most plain rivers dry up in summer, forming small lakes, saline surfaces, wetlands, or go into the ground, got lost in the sands. This is due to the fact that in Kazakhstan there is a significant predominance of the evaporation quaintly from the water surface over the amount of annual precipitation. In the vast spaces of Kazakhstan dispersed several thousand lakes. Uneven water balance

leads to drying up a significant part of the lakes in the summer and autumn, as well as in long-term low-water periods. The geographical position of Kazakhstan – in the central part of Eurasia in the zone of temperate latitudes – defined features and character of natural) – (climatic conditions being the results of the interaction of the underlying surface, solar radiation and atmospheric circulation. The duration of sunshine on the territory of Kazakhstan is quite high, averaging between 2,000 and 3,000 hours per year. Since the quantity of solar radiation influx changes in the direction from north to south, as well as on the seasons of the year, the result is an intense overheating of the earth in the summer, when the value of the total radiation in the south in four times surpass the amount of radiation in the winter months. The consequence of the inland position of Kazakhstan is a sharply continental climate regime, which is characterized by sharp daily, seasonal and annual variations in temperature. Another feature of the climate in Kazakhstan, due to the remoteness from the oceanic moisture source is sharply pronounced aridity. The relative moistening in northern Kazakhstan is 50-30%, and in the desert zone – 5%. The climate of Kazakhstan is also characterized by uneven seasonal distribution of atmospheric precipitation. In winter, on the flat part falls very little precipitation – 50-100 mm (20-30% annual rate), to the foothills and mountains, their quantity increases to 500 mm. The greater part of the precipitation falls during the summer period. Owing to the irregular fall of precipitation already in the spring there is moderately arid weather, and in May – even hot-dry winds. When there is the precipitation particularly little, there is a strong soil desiccation. The soil cover because of uneven distribution of precipitation, soil freezing, action of water melt from snow, strong desiccation, dust storms, hot dry winds and heavy summer rainfall is subjected to erosion. On the territory of Kazakhstan there is often atmospheric drought. The geographical and climatic conditions determine the variety of landscapes. Four natural-landscape zones can be distinguished on the territory of Kazakhstan. The forest-steppe zone is located in the northern part. It is characterized by severe and sharply continental climate, the average maximum snow cover of 30-50 cm and with a length of its bedding in 130-160 days. Active

growing period of vegetation is 120-130 days. The steppe zone occupies a significant part of the territory of Kazakhstan. It stretches from the northern part of the Caspian depression to the Altai and has 2,200 km. The steppe zone is characterized by a predominance of plains and dry, sharply continental climate. Most of the atmospheric precipitation (50% annual rate) falls in summer. The steppe zone distinguishes with the development of wind erosion, especially in the spring period. The steppe zone is characterized by a more aridity and continental climate. Its soils are chernozem with a humus layer thickness of 25-70 cm and brown with a humus layer of 15-30 cm. The semi-desert zone differs with sharply continental, dry climate, hot summers and severe winters. Its main soils are light brown, there is saline land. The thickness of the fertile layer is small, widespread steppe cereals and desert plants. The most part of the plains in Kazakhstan occupies the desert zone, with hot, long summers, very cold winters, low quantity of precipitation, aridity, seasonal, daily and annual air temperature fluctuations, large sandy tracts. On the whole territory of Kazakhstan is observed ice-covered ground phenomena. The consequence of aridity, uneven seasonal distribution of atmospheric precipitation, the poverty of soil resources, poor water content, atmospheric drought, and also freezing of the soil in winter, strong winds, solar radiation, presence of huge sand masses is very low forage productivity of the vegetation cover. Thus, the geographical conditions of Kazakhstan are characterized by high solar radiation quantity, drought, and sharply pronounced aridity, continental, seasonal climate differentiation, its long-term variability, poverty of water and soil resources, shortage of atmospheric precipitation, what in its turn leads to extremely sparse vegetation cover, sharp fluctuations in its productivity, seasonally-zonal features of vegetation, scarcity and low forage productivity of pasture grasses. As a result, the Kazakhstan areas are a very fragile ecosystem, having heightened sensibility to external factors and human economic activities. As a result, in the arid zone of Eurasia has been developed a special form of socio-cultural adaptation and nature use - nomadic cattle-breeding economy. Another group of factors stipulating transition to a nomadic way of production were socio-cultural factors. In the socio-cultural aspect the emergence of

nomadism was predestined to a great extent the previous process of animal domestication and evolution of livestock farming, accumulating knowledge about keeping, using and grazing livestock, organizing a social production system. Many secrets of pastoral-nomadic techniques handed down from father to son, from son to grandson and so on for many generations. It was the knowledge of all the nuances and peculiarities of natural cycles, geographical location of seasonal pastures, the shor Control and various routes of migrating, watering-places, hydrochemical composition of water sources, productive cycles of the vegetation cover, degree of eating and assimilating it by the cattle, fattening process and quality of the physical condition of the animals, atmospheric precipitation and spring floods, the time of setting in and melting the snow cover. The cognition process of the habitat natural resources was spontaneous and was accompanied by developing appropriate socio-cultural mechanisms of adaptation, that is, primarily techniques of grazing, migrating and organization of social production in the optimal range, as well as various elements of the material culture and lifestyle itself. This process was based on the gradual increase of cattle-breeding in the structure of cattle farms (the Bronze Age), refusal of agriculture, gradual transition to seasonal movements and periodic driving cattle off and from one place to another. Researchers in the genesis process of nomadism nark out various transitional stages of development: the house cattle breeding when the animals grow close to home, pastoralism – as a form of moving cattle from one grazing area to another, yaylazhnoe cattle – breeding as a distant type of economy, when the herds for the whole summer were driven to the seasonal pastures in the low mountainous and foothill areas or in the steppe. In the cognition process natural of the ecosystem resources were formed a herd structure, developed organizational principles of the ways of production and multipurpose productivity of livestock farming (meat, milk, wool, and transportation), the establishment of the appropriate lifestyle and traditional everyday culture, improvement of techniques and technologies, horsemanship. The importance for studying the nomadism genesis is the analysis of technological aspects, such as horsemanship, appearance of wells, iron tools, improvement of horse equipment, changes in the herd

structure, and principles of organizing social production. A complex of processing methods and skills, socio-cultural mechanisms in combination with the experience of ecological developing the arid Eurasian space made an information and material basis for transition of pastoral-agricultural type of economy to a new qualitative state and provided the possibility of spontaneous and immanent genesis of nomadism. Thus, a significant role in the development of the formation of the nomadic pastoral economy played a variety of technological improvements and technical innovations of the Bronze Age and early Iron Age. They certainly were one of the main factors of the genesis of nomadism, as promoted optimization of material production system, its greater adaptability and adaptability to changing climatic conditions.

Control questions:

1. Describe the existing concepts about genesis of nomadism in the Eurasian steppes.
2. What group of factors was in your opinion the main in the process of transition to a nomadic way of life as a dominant economy? Give proof of your opinion.
3. Describe the four main natural landscape zones on the territory of Kazakhstan
4. How do you understand the thesis: the climate of the steppe zone of Eurasian steppes has a pronounced arid character? Provide with some examples.
5. Enumerate and give the characteristic of the Eurasian steppes climatogenic factors that caused the transition to a nomadic life.

Tasks for independent study:

Read Chapter 2 «SKULLS OF SAKA TIME» by (7-4 centuries BC) // Ismagulov O. Population of Kazakhstan from Bronze the Epoch to the Present (Paleoanthropological research). – Alma-Ata: Publishing house «Science», Kazakh SSR, 1970 available at: http://s155239215.onlinehome.us/turkic/60_Genetics/Ismagulov/IsmagulovAnthropologyCh2SakaEn.htm.

Write 500 words reaction paper on it, including your understanding of O. Ismagulov's point of view, his arguments on the Eurasian Steppe inhabitance ethnic development continuity from the Iron Age until Nowadays.

Seminar tasks:

1. What is a primary source in historical science? Describe types of historical sources.

2. Students presentation on the topic: «Primary sources about history and culture of the Saka tribes (both written and archeological)».
3. Discussions on the student's essays on the topic: «The significance of Ancient Turkic culture in the World history».
4. Group project on the topic: «The Great Silk Road is the First globalization experience in mankind history» (the essence of the project will be an interactive map on the Silk Road functioning with textual explanations).

II Part

KAZAKHSTAN LANDS IN THE STRUCTURE OF THE TURKIC KHAGANATES (VI-XII CC.)

2.1. The political history of the First Turk khaganate (551-630)

This chapter is written on the base of Chapter eleven of the Cambridge History of Early Inner Asia by Sinor, Denis (Cambridge University Press, 2008). The authors of this chapter assert that the Chinese data concerning the origin of the Turks are contradictory and difficult to interpret. But they note strong corroborative evidence provided by the Turk ancestral legends. There are three versions, showing but a minimal thematic overlap. Even the Cou shu – where two of the three legends are given – remarks on their divergence and comments that they agree only in that in both versions the Turks are said to descend from a she-wolf. The first of these, which we may call that of 'The Abandoned Child Brought up by a Wolf', is related with slight variations by both the Cou shu and the Pei-shih. It tells the story of a young boy mutilated by the enemy and thrown into a marsh where he has intercourse with a she-wolf. The wolf and the boy subsequently took refuge in a cavern, where the wolf gave birth to ten boys. Several generations later the Turks emerged from the cavern and became the blacksmiths of the Juan-juan. There is another legend, also related in the Cou shu, which, in the words of this source, 'differs from the other [legend], nevertheless it shows that [the Turks] descended from a wolf'. The third version of the legend gives entirely different story. A third legend is preserved only in a collection of anecdotes, curious and miraculous histories probably compiled in 860 and entitled the Yu-yang tsa-tsu.

According to this legend, which we may call that of 'The Spirit of the Lake', the ancestor of the Turks, who is called Shê-mo-shê-li and lives in a cavern, has a liaison with the daughter of the lake spirit. One day, as the Turks are preparing for a great hunt, the girl says to Shê-mo:

'Tomorrow during the hunt a white deer with golden horns will come out from the cavern where your ancestors were born [author's emphasis]. If your arrow hits the deer we will keep in touch as long as you live, but if you miss it our relationship will end.' In the course of the hunt, a follower of Shê-mo kills the deer. Shê-mo angrily decapitates the culprit and orders that a human sacrifice be established in which a man of that follower's tribe be beheaded. Today, no one doubts the validity of the Chinese historical works data of ancient Turkic legends as they were received from the Turks themselves and written by Chinese authors. The Turks built their empire on the ruins of the Juan-juan. In 439, when the Northern Wei emperor T'ai-wu destroyed the small barbarian state of North Liang, established in Kansu by Chü-ch'u family, some five hundred Turk families sought refuge with the Juan-juan. The reasons that prompted this action remain unknown, but the sources report that the Turks, all of whom bore the surname Ashina, were settled by the Juan-juan in the Altai, where they worked on the manufacture of iron implements. The Gold Mountain where they worked had a shape of a helmet which in their language was called Turk. The last pages of the Juan – juan's domination in Mongolia remain unknown. But we know that in 552 the Turks rebelled against the Juan – juanes. The death of Anakui presented Bumin and his Turk people with the task of ruling over a great empire. Two centuries later in the Orkhon inscription were recorded memories of those events:

«When high above the blue sky and down below the brown earth had been created, betwixt the two were created the sons of men. And above the sons of men stood my ancestors, the khagans Bumin and Ishtemi. Having become the masters of the Turk people, they installed and ruled its empire and fixed the law of the country. Many were their enemies in the four corners of the world, but, leading campaigns against them, they subjugated and pacified many nations in the four corners of the world. They caused them to bow their

heads and to bend their knees. There were wise khagans, these were valiant khagans, all their officers were wise and valiant; the nobles, all of them, the entire people were just. This was the reason why they were able to rule an empire so great, why, govering the empire, they could uphold the law». The founder of Turkic power was a wily politician named Bumin, who bore the title of khagan, or ruler. How he became leader of the Altay Turks is not known. But having forged an alliance with the Western Wei dynasty of China, Bumin deliberately provoked the Juan-juan into a war by demanding one of their princesses in marriage. Aided by Chinese forces, the Turks routed the Juan-juan in 552 and then subjugated neighboring nomadic tribes to become unconControled master of the Mongolian steppe. Bumin, the founder of the Turk Empire, died soon after his victory and was followed by his son Kuo-lo, who ruled only a few months. From the very formation the Turk empire was bifocal. The eastern part, centered on Mongolia, had the supremacy of the two halves. It was ruled by Muhan (553-572), son of Bumin, whereas the western parts fell to Bumin's brother Ishtemi (553-?). Together, they are the founding fathers of the First Turk khaganate. Because of the large size of the territory, which was controlled by the Turks there existed an administrative division, while retaining significant powers of local rulers. Menander Byzantine, wrote that the First Turk khaganate was divided into four parts. Chinese sources also note a clear division into four administrative units – Central, East, West and the Western Frontier regions. The ruler of the Central region was the Great Khagan. Muhan embarked upon a series of military conquests. He wiped out the last identifiable military forces of the Juan-juan. In the east Muhan defeated the Kitans, in the north he incorporated the Kirgiz into his realm; in the west he defeated the Hephthalites; his might extended from the Pacific to the Western Sea and to Lake Baikal in the north, he subdued «all the countries outside China», as it was rapturously written in Chou shu.

Also Muhan was nominally created with the defeat of the Hephthalites, the campaign against them was probably led by Ishtemi, his uncle, who was in charge of the Western Frontier Region. The Hephthalite State was destroyed between 557-561 through the joint action of the Turk khagan Ishtemi and Khosrow I

Anushrven, king of the Persians. Cooperation between the Sassanid King and the Turks was not uniformly harmonious; though their alliance was strengthen by Khosrow's marrying a daughter of the Turk ruler. In their contacts with Byzantium, Persians and Turks both claimed suzerainty over the land of the defunct Hephthalite Empire, the partition of which created a new situation in Central Asia. Since 527 Persia and Byzantium were engaged in a series of wars. The appearance of major power and potential ally on Persian's eastern border was a fact which Byzantine diplomacy could ill afford to ignore. In contract, an alliance with Byzantium directed against the Persians would have held little political promise for the Turks, whose cooperation with Khosrow – as a joint campaign against the Hephthalites showed could be fruitful. But the deterioration of Turko-Persian relations occurred as Sogdian merchants in pursuit of profit from the trade in silk with Iran and Byzantium had made efforts to this. Sogdian merchants, to whom at the Hephthalite's power, silk trade effectively assigned, convinced their new lord, the Turk khagan, to send in 568 – a commercial mission to Persia, in order to obtain permission for carry out trade in silk within the country. Although the mission was carried out under the patronage of the Turks, in fact it was Sogdian headed by Sogdian Maniakh. However, Khosrov, fearing the Turks free access to his country and disinterested in a sharp increase in import silk in the Iranian market, what would lower the income of local silk weaving production, bought the silk brought by Maniakh and then burned it. Then Maniakh made an attempt to find a buyer of the silk in the face of Byzantium. In 568, he arrived in Byzantium at the head of the embassy before the eyes of the Byzantine Emperor Justin II who received the Turks with much attention. Byzantium also as Iran was not in acute need of the Sogdian silk, but was interested in an alliance with the Turks against the Persians. So, knowing about it, the Sogdian ambassadors sought to conclude a trade agreement. So the Turkic embassy was received at the imperial court and a military agreement against Iran between the Turks and the Byzantine Empire was signed. The response embassy came to the Turks in August 569 under the leadership of the strategus Zemerhos. Menander gave a detailed and trustworthy account of Zemarkhos' journey to the Turks.

Maniakh invited Zemarkhos to accompany him on a foray against the Persians. Zemarkhos was also present at an altercation between his host and a Persian ambassador. The Turkic attack on Iran finished with the capture of a several wealthy cities in Gurgan, and soon retur of the Turks to Sogd in 569. Following it Ishtemi carried military operations to the Volga, by 571, he had won the North Caucasus, and soon reached the Bosporus (Kerch). With these actions Khagan cleared roundabout way to Byzantium (through KKhwarezm, the Volga region, the Caucasus and Crimea). In the period between 568 and 576 diplomatic contacts were frequent; the Byzantine historian Menander mentioned seven Roman embassies to the Turks. The inControline war in the First Turk khaganate inside the ruling clan for the inheritance lasted more than twenty years and ended in 603 with the disintegration into two states – the Western Turk khaganate in Central Asia, including Dzhungaria and a part of Eastern Turkestan and Eastern Turk khaganate in Mongolia. It should be noted that the Western Turk khaganate (its self-designation was «On Ok Eli» – «The Ten Arrows State») very considerably differed from the Turk khaganate in the east. In the Western Turk khaganate nomadic life prevailed, but in the Eastern Turk khaganate most part of the population was settled and occupied with farming and trade. The social structure of the Western Turk khaganate was much more complex, it could be rightfully regarded as an early state. On the territory of the Western Turk khaganate existed urban and agricultural culture. There were created with the help of the Sogdians, who put their trade and agricultural colonies on the Great Silk Road – in Semirechye, Dzhungaria, Eastern Turkestan, Northern China. In the V-VII centuries Sogdian intensive colonization in the valleys of the rivers Chu, Talas, Ili resulted in the emergence of a dozen cities and fortified settlements there. Only in the Chu Valley in the VI-VIII centuries there were at least 18 large cities and small settlements. In the Western Turk khaganate the khagan's power was not as strong as in the east. In consequence of the weakness of the khagan's power and the fact that tribal nobility was in a constant state of struggle, positions of small and large Sogdian merchants were extremely profitable. They had an opportunity to act as a third force in any large internal or external conflict. Although Turkic

khagans called the Sogdians as tatami – subjects, but their role was very significant, since they control the whole economic life of the state.

Control questions:

1. Prove the following statement: the ancient Turks were widely included in international relations of that time (with the Hephthalite Empire, Sasanian Iran and the Byzantium Empire).
2. Define the main stages of the First Turk khaganate political history (551-630).
3. Prove the following thesis: the Western Turk khaganate highly significantly differed from the Turk khaganate in the East.
4. Define the Sogdian's role in the life of the First Turk khaganate.

2.2. Kazakhstan lands under the Western Turk khagans and its successors' power

The heyday of the Western Turk khaganate came at the time of Shegui (609-618) and Tong Yabghu khagan (619-630) reign. It was the time of the greaControl territorial expansion of the Western Turks. So, Shegui made Altai the eastern border of the khaganate and extended his rule to the Tarim Basin and the Eastern Pemir region. Tong Yabghu (also known as T'ung Yabghu, Ton Yabghu, Tong Yabghu khagan, Tun Yabghu, and Tong Yabğu, T'ung yabghu khagan) was khagan of the Western Turkic khaganate from 618 to 630 C.E. His name is usually translated as «Tiger Yabgu» in old Turkic. Another interpretation of his name is «sufficiency» or «completeness». He was the brother of Shegui (611-618), the previous khagan of the western GökTurks, and was a member of the Ashina clan. Tong Yabghu's reign is generally regarded as the zenith of the Western Turk khaganate[3]. It was the time of the greaControl territorial expansion of the Western Turks. So, Shegui made Altai the eastern border of the khaganate and extended his rule to the Tarim Basin and the Eastern Pemir region. Tong Yabghu revived active western policy of the khaganate and carried his winter residence to Suyab – a large trade-handicraft center in the Chu Valley (now close

[3] Tong-Yabghu-Kagan // See: http://www.statemaster.com/encyclopedia.

by Tokmak in Kyrgizstan), but the summer residence – to Ming-Bulak village (not far from Turkestan city). New campaigns widened the Western Turk khaganate borders to the Amu-Darya River and the Hindu Kush Himalaya mountain system. Tong Yabghu maintained close relations with the Tang Dynasty of China, and may have married into the Imperial family. The Chinese Buddhist pilgrim Xuanzang visited the western GökTurk capital Suyab in modern Kyrgyzstan and left a description of the khagan. Xuanzang described the khagan as follows: The khan wore a green satin robe; his hair, which was ten feet long, was free. A band of white silk wound round his forehead and hung down behind. The ministers of the presence numbering two hundred in number, all wearing embroidered robes, stood on his right and left. The rest of his military retinue [was] clothed in fur, serge and fine wool, the spears and standards and bows in order, and the riders of camels and horses stretched far out of [sight]. Tong Yehu Khagan is a man of bravery and astuteness. He is good at art of war. Thus he controlled Tiele tribes to the north, confronted Persia to the west, connected with Kasmira (nowadays Kashmir) to the south. All countries are subjected to him. He controlled ten thousands of men with arrow and bow, establishing his power over the western region. He occupied the land of Wusun and moved his tent to Qianquan north of Tashkent. All of the princes of western region assumed the Turk office of Jielifa. Tong Yehu Khagan also sent a Tutun to monitor them for imposition. The power of Western Turks had never reached such a state before". Tong Yabghu's empire fought with the Sassanids of Iran. In the early 620's the khagan's nephew Buri-sad led a series of raids across the Caucasus Mountains into Persian territory. Scholarly consensus has identified Tong Yabghu as the Ziebel mentioned in Byzantine sources as having (as khagan of the Khazars) campaigned with the Emperor Heraclius in the Caucasus against the Sassanid Persian Empire in 627-628. or any Khazar ruler) and may actually have died as early as 626. These scholars point to discrepancies in the dates between Byzantine and Chinese sources and argue that definitively conflating Ziebel with Tong Yabghu is an exaggeration of the extant evidence. In 627 the Turks penetrated the Gates of Alexander and sacked the city of Derbent (The Citadel, Ancient City and Fortress

Buildings of Derbent are part of a strategic Sasanian defence system from the 5th century. Derbent is situated on the western shores of the Caspian Sea, in present-day Dagestan. It was in the position to control the traffic between Europe and the Middle East, and shield the prospering agricultural peoples of the Middle East from devastating raids of nomadic tribes from the steppes of South-Eastern Europe). Movses khagankatvatsi describes the attack thus: «Like waves in the sea, the Turks fell on the town of Chora (Derbent) and destroyed it completely. Seeing the terrible threat posed by this vile, ugly, horde of attackers, with their slanting and lidless eyes, and their flowing hair like that of women, the inhabitants were seized by terror. Especially terrifying were the archers, who were skillful and powerful, and rained arrows down like hail then, like savage wolves, shamelessly through themselves on the people and mercilessly cut them down in the streets and squares of the town. They did not even take pity on the children who hugged their slaughtered mothers, but sucked the children's blood like milk». The Derbent sparked panic all over the country. Albanian forces withdrew to their capital, Partav, then headed into the Caucasus Mountains. The GökTurks and Khazars overtook them near the village of Kalankatuyk, where they were either slain or taken prisoner. The conquerors imposed upon Albania a heavy system of taxation, as reported by Movses: «The Lord of the North [one of the titles of the GökTurk khagan) wreaked havoc all over the country. He sent his wardens to deal with artisans of all kind, especially those skilled in washing out gold, extraction of silver and iron, as well as making copper items. He imposed duties on fishers and goods from the great Kura and Aras rivers, in addition to the didrachma traditionally levied by the Persian authorities». Later that year Tong Yabghu's army joined Heraclius in the siege of Tfilis. Heraclius and Tong Yabghu met under the walls of Narikala. The yabghu rode up to the emperor, kissed his shoulder and made a bow. In return, Heraclius hugged his ally, called him his son, and crowned him with his own diadem. During the ensuing feast the Khazar leaders received ample gifts in the shape of earrings and clothes, while the yabghu was promised the hand of the emperor's daughter, Eudoxia Epiphania. Tong Yabghu placed an army of 40,000 Khazar horsemen

at Heraclius' disposal. The initial seige of Tfilis was unsuccessful; both leaders were ridiculed by the Georgian defenders of the city. In 628 Heraclius struck southwards into Persia while Tong Yabghu's army again besieged Tfilis, this time successfully. Many of the defenders were executed, blinded, or mutilated[4]. Tong Yabghu could establish stronger control in the practically independent before Central Asian states, that earlier only paid taxes. The Western Turkic khaganate had the territory from the Tashkent oasis to the territories of southern Afganistan and north-western Pakistan. Tong Yabghu appointed governors or tuduns to manage the various tribes and people under his over lordship. Besides, Tong Yabghu granted Turkic titles to local Central Asian rulers, as if including them in the administrative hierarchy of the khaganate. And with the purpose to strengthen still more relations with local rulers, he married his daughter to the most powerful of them – the Samarkand ruler. But the tribal nobility did not like despotic character of his governing and in the Western Turkic khaganate began an inter-tribal war. As a result by 630-634 the Western Turkic khaganate had already lost its Central Asian possessions to the west from the Syr Darya river. The Western Turkic khaganate entered into a protracted political crisis, the main reason of which was struggle for power between the nobility of two confederations – the tension between Dulu and Nushibi. In 634 Yshbara Elterish Shir-kagan, supported by Nushibi came to power. Ye carried out reforms, according to which the Irkins and Chors' chief turned into the rulers appointed by him. Besides, in each area was sent a khagan tribe member-Shad, who not connected with the tribal nobility. With these reforms he wanted to restrict influence and power of local chiefs. But resources of the khaganate turned out to the insufficient to hold tribes in obedience. Thus in 638 Dulu proclaimed khagan one of the sheds, sent to them. After the war between Dulu and Nushibi the Western Turkic khaganate disintegrated into two parts, the border line between which lay along the Ili River. Intertribal dynasty war continued the following 17 years.

[4] Tong-Yabghu-Khagan see; http://www.statemaster.com/encyclopedia/Tong-Yabghu-Khagan.

(640-657) and led to invasion of Chinese troops in Semirechye. Following the death of Tong Yabghu in ca. 630, the might of the Western GökTurks largely collapsed. Tang China tried to rule over the Western Turks relyinf upon its protégé from the Ashina clan. But the Western Turks did not stop their struggle for independence. The Turgesh khaganate seems to have come into existence towards the end of the 7th century, after a massive revolt against the Western Turks khan, a Chinese puppet. The Turgesh leader was Ushyly (Wushile), who titled himself Baga Tarkhan and led a strong army to victory, putting the puppet khan to full speed flight. His power soon spanned from the present-day Semirechye area to Turfan and Kucha. Ushyly khagan then decided to ally with Tang China and the Kyrgyz people to stem the rise of the Second GökTurk Empire, ruled by Khapghan khagan. In the Chui River и Ili River Valleys he established khagan's headquarters, the country was divided into 20 regions. Turgesh and GökTurks/Turküts clashed in 698 in a battle fought at Bolchu (in modern Dzhungaria) where the latter side, led by Bilge Tonyukhukh, prevailed: the Yabgu (Ruler of West) and Shad (Ruler of East) of the Turgesh were killed and Ushyly Khaghan himself was taken a prisoner and had to concede vassalage. Eight years after this burning defeat, Ushyly died and was replaced by his son, Soko, who fought to retain independence from the GökTurks/Turküts. The successor of Ushyly khagan Soko defeated the rebelled tribes supported by the Chinese troops. Soko wanted to make Tang China stop invasions in Semirechye. He implemented this task. He was defeated in 701 in Transoxiana, southeast of Samarkand, again by Tonyukhukh, and finally in 711, when he was killed at Bolchu against Kül Tigin and Bilge Shad as he was trying to strike an alliance with Tang China. The Turgesh were put under the rule of Bars Bek; as we know from the Orkhon Inscriptions in those years the main subdivision in Kara (Black) and Sary (Yellow) Turgesh was established. Maybe sensing the impending disaster, Soko's brother Chenu had revolted even before the battle and fled to the court of Khapghan Khaghan. In 711 г. the Eastern Turks defeated Soko's troops in Dzhungaria and till 715 The Turgesh khaganate stopped its existence. Three years later the Kara Turgesh elected Sulu as their Khaghan. The new ruler moved his capital to Balasagun in

the Chu valley, receiving the homage of several chieftains formerly bond to the service of Bilge Khaghan of the Turküt. He had to struggle on two fronts. In the west the Arabs, who on 714-715 carried on campaigns beyond the Syr Darya threatened the Turgesh. In the east the Chinese threatened the Turgesh. Sulu took action to neutralize the eastern threat. For that in 717 г. he went to a diplomatic trip to Chang'an-the capital of Tang Empire. After that he contracted conjugal unions with three potentially dangerous rulers. He got married to a daughter of Western Turks descendant from Ashina clan, thereby, having legitimated his power. The second wife became a daughter of Bilge Khaghan – the ruler of the Eastern Turk khaganate. The Tibet Tsar's daughter Sulu became his third wife.

Sulu acted as a bulwark against further Umayyad encroachment from the south: the Arabs had indeed become a major player in recent times, despite Islam had not made many converts in Central Asia (that would need some two or three more centuries). Sulu's aim was to reconquer all of Transoxiana from the Arab invaders - his war was paralleled, much more westwards, by the Khazar empire. In 721 Turgesh forces, led by Kül Chor, defeated the Caliphal army commanded by Sa'id ibn Abdu'l-Aziz near Samarkand. Sa'id's successor, Al-Kharashi, massacred Turks and Sogdian refugees in Khujand, causing an influx of refugees towards the Turgesh. In 724 Caliph Hisham sent a new governor to Khorasan, Muslim ibn Sa'id, with orders to crush the «Turks» once and for all, but, confronted by Sulu Khagan, Muslim hardly managed to reach Samarkand with a handful of survivors, as the Turgesh raided freely. A string of subsequent appointees of Hisham were soundly defeated by Sulu Khagan, who in 728 even managed to take Bukhara and later on still inflicted painful tactical defeats upon the Arabs, discrediting Umayyad rule and maybe putting the foundations for the Abbasid revolution. The Turgesh state was at its apex of glory, controlling Sogdiana, the Ferghana Valley It was only in 732, that two powerful Arab expeditions to Samarakand managed, if with embarrassing losses, to reestablish Caliphal authority in the area; Sulu renounced his ambitions over Samarkand and abandoned Bukhara, with drawing north. In 734 an early Abbasid follower, Kha'ris ibn Suraidj,

rose in revolt against Umayyad rule and took Balkh and Marv before defecting to the Turgesh three years later, defeated. In 738 Sulu Khaghan, along with his allies Kha'ris, Gurak (a Turco-Sogdian leader) and men from Usrushana, Tashkent and Khuttal to lauch a final offensive. He entered Jowzjan but was defeated by the Umayyad governor Ased at the Battle of Sa'n or Kharistan. The defeat meant death for Sulu – as soon as he was back in Balasaghun he was murdered at the hands of Baga Tarkhan Kül Chor, leader of the Sary (Yellow) Turgesh. This, in turn, laid the foundations for the early demise of the Turgesh Empire, who had so far challenged the might of the Caliphate. When Sulu Khaghan was killed the Kara and Sary (Black and Yellow) Turgesh began a civil war. Kül Chor of the Sary Türgish vanquished his rival Tumoche of the Kara Turgesh and ascended to khanship, not before slaying Sulu's sons. In 739 he enriched his criminal record by killing Hin of the GökTurk Ashina clan, the «legitimate» puppet-khaghan in Tang service. The Chinese reacted by supporting the rebellious Kara Turgesh, which in 742 found in Iltutmish Khutlugh Bilge a new Khaghan, later succeeded by Tengrideh Bolmysh in 753. This last ruler declared himself a vassal of Moyun Chor, the ruling Khaghan of the recently born Orkhon Uyghur empire. The Turgesh civil war came to a sudden end only in 766, when annals record that the Qarluqs smashed the Turgesh. The Qarluqs were the forerunners of the later Karakhanid Muslim state. But the Chinese's successes people are seriously concerned the governor of the Abbasid Caliphate in the Arab Khorasan (a region located in north eastern Iran) and called opposition from the Qarluqs. In the middle of the VII c. the Qarluqs actively showed themselves in the political life of the Western Turk khaganate, where they controlled the Dzhungar-Altai region and Tokharistan – a name which was given to Bactria (Bactriana, in Persian, was the ancient Greek name of the country between the range of the Hindu Kush and the Amu Darya (Oxus). They remained in the Chinese sphere of influence and an active participant in fighting the Muslim expansion into the area, up until their betrayal of the Tang at the Battle of Talas in 751. In 751 the Chinese and Arabs troops met on the Talas River and several days did not make their mind to join the battle. On the fifth day of withstanding the Qarluqs

took in the rear of the Chinese, thereby having achieved a turning point in the battle in favor of the Arabs. Battle of Talas in 751 was a conflict between the Arab Abbasid Caliphate and the Chinese Tang Dynasty for control of the Syr Darya. The Chinese army was defeated following the routing of their troops by the Abbasids on the bank of the Talas River. The defeat was partly a result of the defection of Qarluq mercenaries and the retreat of Ferghana valleys who originally supported the Chinese. The Ferghana forces successfully (though inadvertently) cut the Chinese troops off from the rest of their army and their route of retreat. The commander of the Tang forces, Gao Xianzhi, realized his defeat was imminent and managed to escape with some of his Tang regulars with the help of Li Siye. Despite losing the battle, Li did inflict heavy losses on the pursuing Arab army after being reproached by Duan Xiushi. Though Gao was able to rebuild his forces within months, he never again gained the confidence of the local tribes residing in the area. The Chinese name Daluosi was first seen in the account of Xuanzang. Du Huan located the city near the western drain of the Chui River. The exact location of the battle has not been confirmed but is believed to be near Taraz (once named Zhambyl), in present day Kazakhstan. Shortly after the battle of Talas, the domestic rebellion of An Lushan (755－763) and subsequent warlords (763 onwards), caused the decline of Tang influence in Central Asia by the end of the 700's. The local Tang tributaries then switched to the authority of the Abbasids, Tibetans, or Uighurs and the introduction of Islam was thus facilitated among the Turkic peoples. Well supported by the Ummayads, the Qarluqs established a state that would be absorbed in the late 9th century by the Kara-Khanid Khanate. With the successful cooperation of Arabs and Turkic peoples, Islam began to exert its influence on the Turkic culture. Among the earliest historians to proclaim the importance of this battle was the great Russian historian of Muslim central Asia, Barthold, according to whom, «The earlier Arab historians, occupied with the narrative of events then taking place in western Asia, do not mention this battle; but it is undoubtedly of great importance in the history of (Western) Turkestan as it determined the question which of the two civilizations, the Chinese or the Muslim, should predominate in the

land (of Turkestan)». However, claims that the battle itself was significant are not well-supported by historical evidence. The dry and simplistic recounting of the battle itself in Chinese accounts shows that it may have been no more than a border skirmish. Most of the sources for this battle barely mention the Chinese defeat, leaving a duration of five days undescribed, with exception for the dialogues after the defeat. According to Barthold, for the history of the first three centuries of Islam, al-Tabari was the chief source (survived in Ibn al Athir's compilation), which was brought down to 915. (Unfortunately, this important work was only compiled and published by a group of Orientalists in 1901.) It is only in Athir that we find an accurate account of the conflict between the Arabs and the Chinese in 751, one which decided the fate of the western part of central Asia. Neither Tabari nor the early historical works of the Arabs which have come down to us in general make any mention of this; however, Athir's statement is completely confirmed by the Chinese History of the Tang Dynasty. It must be noted that in all Arab sources, the events which occurred in the eastern part of the empire are often dealt with briefly. Another notable informant of the battle on the Muslim side was Al-Dhahabi (1274-1348). It is of interest to note that the Battle of Talas is seen as the key event in the technological transmission of the paper-making process. The Chinese court eunuch Cai Lun had invented the process in 105 CE. After the battle of Talas, knowledgeable Chinese prisoners of war were ordered to produce paper in Samarkand, and by the year 794 CE, a paper mill could be found in Baghdad, modern-day Iraq. The technology of paper making was thus transmitted to the Islamic world and later to the West. Other than the transfer of paper, there is no evidence to support a geopolitical or demographic change resulting from this battle. Several of the factors after the battle had been taken note of prior to 751. Firstly, the Qarluq never in any sense remained opposed to the Chinese after the battle. In 753, the Qarluq Yabgu Dunpijia submitted under the column of Cheng Qianli and captured A-Busi, a betrayed Chinese mercenary of Tongluo (Tiele) chief (who had defected earlier in 743), and received his title in the court on October 22. Nor did the Chinese expansion halt after the battle; the Chinese commander Feng Changqing, who took over the

position from Gao Xianzhi through Wang Zhengjian, virtually swept across the Kashmir region and captured Gilgit shortly in the same year. The Chinese influence to the west of the Pemir Mountains certainly did not cease as the result of the battle; the Ferghana, who participated in the battle earlier, in fact joined among the central Asian auxiliaries with the Chinese army under a summons and entered Gansu during An Lushan's revolt in 756. Neither did the relations between the Chinese and Arabs worsen, as the Abbasids, like their predecessors (since 652), continued to send embassies to China uninterruptedly after the battle. Such visits had overall resulted in 13 diplomatic gifts between 752—798. Not all Turkic tribes of the region converted to Islam after the battle either – the date of their mass-conversion to Islam was much later, in the 10th century under Musa[5]. The Qarluqs with their participation in the Battle of Talas in 751 did not spoil relations with Tang China. The reason for approaching the Qarluqs and the Chinese became their common struggle against the Uighurs' strengthening. In 752 the Qarluqs, having enlisted the Chinese support declared war on the Uighurs. The Qarluq Yabgu struggled for the Eastern Turk khaganate inheritance. His allies became the Yenisei Kyrghyz, Basmils и Turgesh. The war with variable success lasted two years and waged in the very center of the Uighurs lands. With great troubles the head of the Uighurs achieved victory. Consequences of the war were the great importance for the Qarluqs future. The Qarluq Yabgu once and for all lost hopes concerning the khaganate and stopped his struggle for the Turk inheritance. Since then his aspirations were directed on capturing Semirechye and consolidating in Dzhungar and towns of the Tarim Basin. B Semirechye the Qarluqs met with resistance not small Turgesh principalities that on the contrary became allies and vassals of Yabgu, but the Oghuz tribes. General events of the struggle with the Oghuz have been poorly reflected in sources. It is known that in the second half of the VIII в. Oghuz left Semirechye и and went to lower reaches of the Syr Darya. Their head took the Yabgu title, aspirating domination over the Western Turk tribes. During the ninth and tenth centuries, the nomadic Turkic Oghuz

[5] Battle of Talas in 751. See online encyclopedia Statemaster.com URL: http://www.statemaster.com/encyclopedia/Battle-of-Talas.

tribes formed a principality on the middle and lower reaches of the Syr Darya (Jaxartes), in the Aral Sea region and the area of the northern Caspian with its Yangikent, the town on the Syr Darya. The Oghuz's power was finally consolidated in Semirechye in 766., when they occupied towns Taraz и Suab. Then the Qarluks began was with the Uighurs for Eastern Turkestan. Despite failures in the wars of the beginning of the IX в. the Qarluqs's situation, supported by rich Semirechye towns was firm. Trade with Turkic slaves for Abbasids's quad and control over transit to China on the area from Taraz to Issyk-Kul lake favoured the Yabgu's enrichment. The futher history of the Qarluqs was absorbed in the late of the 9th century by the Kara-Khanid Khanate. In the East of the Kazakhstan in the Irtysh river steppes formed a community of Turkic tribes, which were called **the Kimeks**, by contemprory authors. Up to the middle of the eighth century, they lived with the Turkic tribes of the southern Altai and the Tarbagatay to the south and the Kyrgyz of the Yenisei to the east. At some time during the second half of the eighth century or at the beginning of the ninth, the Kimek clans and several tribes moved to north-eastern Semirechye and the foothills of the Dzhungar range, while at the same time, the Kipchak tribes of the Irtysh migrated southwards and westwards. From the ninth to the eleventh century, the Kimek were more densely concentrated in the basin of the middle Irtysh and in north-eastern Semirechye. Individual Kimek groups and a large proportion of the Kipchak occupied the steppes of central Kazakhstan and the northern Lake Balkhash region, extending as far west as the Aral Sea region and the southern Urals. On the middle reaches of the Syr Darya, they roamed the area of Sawran and the town of Turkistan, while their eastern borders stretched to the Tarbagatay Mountains and the Dzhungarian Alatau. Up to the middle of the seventh century, the Kimek, along with other steppe peoples, had been part of the Khaganate of the Western Turks. After its collapse in 656, they gradually developed into an independent tribal confederation. This process received considerable impetus during the ninth century from the fall of the Uighur Khaganate. The head of the Kimek, who had previously held the modest title of shad tutuk, was subsequently called the Khagan. According to Arab and Persian writers of the ninth to the twelfth century, the Khagan enjoyed

considerable power appointing the leaders of tribes, referred to in the sources as muluk (kings). According to al-Idrisi, power in the clan of the Kimek rulers was transmitted on a hereditary basis. The supreme ruler, the Khagan, had eleven 'stewards' whose duties were also transmitted from father to son and he and his court nobles resided in a capital situated in the valley of the Irtysh The Kimek principality, formed at the end of the ninth century and the beginning of the tenth, was divided into a number of domains like the later ulus. The rulers of these appanages, who were the descendants of hereditary tribal rulers, received their lands from the Khagan in return for military service. Some Kimek groups moved for the winter to the steppes between the Ural and the Emba and spent the summer as nomads in the area of the Irtysh, especially when there were severe winters in what is now eastern and central Kazakhstan. Some of the Oghuz also moved to pastures in the Kimek country near Lake Mankur, probably in the foothills of the Alatau. Like the Kipchak and the Oghuz, the Kimek bred horses, sheep, goats, oxen, cows and camels. Sheep, in particular, played an important part in their economy. al-Idrisi, describing the life of the nomads, writes that they 'used fat instead of vegetable oil and tallow for lighting'. The horses of the steppe-dwellers were noted for their hardiness and their ability to adapt to the harsh conditions of the arid zone. Gardızı refers to the huge herds of horses raised by the Kimek, and al-Idrisi notes that the nomads preferred horsemeat to beef or mutton and made koumiss (a drink of fermented mares' milk). The Kimek also possessed cattle, i.e. cows and oxen; these tended to be owned by semisedentary elements, although oxen were also used as draught animals. The steppe-dwellers usually harnessed them to carts on which they placed their yurts (wooden-framed tents covered with felt). Like the Oghuz and the Kipchak, the Kimek hunted furry animals such as the fox, marten and beaver, and further took the pelts of sable, ermine and predators like tigers and snow leopards. The fur and hides of wild animals and the meat and skins of domestic livestock were sold or exchanged at points adjacent to the settled lands in the south. In the ninth and tenth centuries, the Kimek state was one of the strongest nomadic powers in Central Asia, but it gradually began to decline when the system of semi- independent domains sapped the authority of the Khagans, so

that the Kimek tribal entity collapsed, unable to withstand the pressure of neighboring nomadic peoples[6].

Control questions:

1. Prove that in the first quarter of the VII century the Western Turk khaganate was at the height of its military-political might.
2. What was a foreign-political activity of Tong Yabghu khagan (618-630)?
3. How did Tong Yabghu khagan institute stronger political control over the Central Asian possessions of the Turks?
4. Depict the political history of the Turgesh state, the end of the 7th –the middle of the 8th centuries)?
5. Define the historical significance of the Battle of Talas in 751.

2.3. Cultural heritage of the Turks

2.3.1. Religions and beliefs of ancient Turks

This chapter was written on the base of the article «Ancient Turkic Religious Beliefs (before islam)[7]». The religious beliefs in the early Turkish states on the plateaus of Central Asia coalesced around three main points. The first of these was a belief in animistic forces. These early Turks attributed conscious life and a discrete in-dwelling spirit to every material form of nature (such as plants and stones), to celestial bodies (sun, moon, stars), and to natural phenomena (storms, earthquakes, etc.). The Uighurs, for example, practiced a form of astrology in which the movements of the moon and stars were consulted before setting out a campaign.

The second was an ancestral cult in which the memories of departed ancestors and leaders were kept alive through reverence and animal sacrifice. Upon a death, a period of mourning was observed. The dead were buried, cremated or mummified. A kurgan (earthen barrow), mound or cairn of stones was erected so that the departed

[6] Agajanov S. G. The States of the Oghuz, the Kimek and the Kipchak. – P. 74-77. URL: http://ru.unesco.org/silkroad/sites/silkroad/files/knowledge-bank-article/vol_IVa%20silk%20road_the%20states%20of%20the%20oghuz,%20the%20kimek%20and%20the%20kipchak. pdf. Avaiable: 20 June. 2016.

[7] Ancient Turkish Religious Beliefs (Pre-Islam). Posted: 17 June. 2005. URL: http://www.allempires.com/forum/forum_posts.asp?TID = 4017.

spirit would have a place to call its own. Sometimes stone statues (called balbal) were set up.

The third element was the worship of the sky god (Gok Tangri). While animism and ancestral cults are common among early tribal cultures, this particular form of sky god worship appears only among the Turks. In this system of belief, the sky god is the Supreme Being. The Blue Turks (who called themselves KokTürk) believed that their empire's formation was a consequence of the sky god's wishes and that their khagan (leader) had been sent to them by their god. Tangri took a personal interest in the independent existence of the Turks, and victory in battle was a result of Tangri's will. Tangri commanded and punished the disobedient, and life and death alike were dependent upon his will. Tangri granted life and could take it back whenever he wished. According to these early Turkish beliefs, Tangri was eternal and the creator of all that existed. He was also singular and could not be reduced to any material form. This is why one never finds idols to Tangri or temples to put them in. Tangri was a great, solitary, spiritual power. The sun, moon, stars, fire and rivers were his hallowed assistants who occupied positions much like the angels, prophets and scriptures of the Semitic deities.

During the Uighur period (these were one of Turkic peoples who dominated Mongolia and eastern Turkestan from the eighth to the 12th centuries, now inhabiting northwestern China), the sky god cult was still practiced but had begun to encounter competition from Manichaeanism and Buddishm, which were spreading among the Turks. Both faiths became particularly entrenched during the Uighur control of Turkistan.

The original writing system of the Blue Turks was supplanted by that of the Uighurs, which was based on the Sogdian. Under the Uighurs, Buddhist and Manichaean scriptures were translated, and a rich liturgical literature developed. Some time before the 10th century, the Uighurs invented a system of printing that involved making impressions of single-letter molds on paper. This was the forerunner of the printing press and modern printing technology.

The communities of the early steppe lander (steppe-dwellers) Turks tended to be political associations rather than religious ones, and for that reason religious leaders did not play as great a role

among them as they did among desert and forest-dwellers. The religious beliefs of these people were centered around three fundamental tenets.

The first of these was a worship of the forces of nature. Early Turks attributed conscious life and a discrete in-dwelling spirit to mountains, hills, rocks, valleys, streams, springs, caves, trees, volcanic lakes, iron and sword handles. Celestial bodies such as the sun, moon, and stars and natural phenomena such as lightning and thunder were thought to be spirits or deities. There were both good spirits and evil ones. In some inscriptions there are also references to a goddess whose name is given as Umay (Umai). Such animistic beliefs are common among all early tribal cultures. For instance among the Asian Huns, horses and sheep were sacrificed to the sky god, to ancestors, and to the forces of nature during the first month of the year at the palace of their ruler, and in late spring (June) in the vicinity of the Ongkin river. The Blue Turks and Uighurs made similar sacrifices during the same month at the source of the Temir river. The Huns also conducted a similar ritual in the fall at Tai-lin. Among the Blue Turks, there were three sacred rituals held during the year in which sacrifices were offered to Tangri (the sky god) and to ancestors. Both the Blue Turks and Uighurs practiced astrology, determining the advisability of courses of action upon the positions and movement of the planets and stars. The Tabgatch planted beech trees by their graves and regarded them as sacred. Forces of nature called yer-sub (in modern Kazakh, «jer-su», meaning «earth-and-water») were genies or sprits dwelling in hills and springs that were considered to be sacred (iduk) places. Tamik-iduk-bas and Iduk-otuken are two such sites. In the Uighurs' Kutlu-Dag Efsanesi («Legend of Happy-Mountain»), a rock is held to be sacred because its houses a spirit that gives people strength and fortitude. To cause rain or hail to fall or to make the wind blow, the ancient Turks had recourse to a natural magic involving a stone that they believed to be sacred.

The second pillar of this religion was an ancestral cult. The worship of departed leaders and the veneration of ancestors are thought to be a manifestation of a patriarchal social order in religion. The Asian Huns, Tabgatch and Blue Turks frequently offered

sacrifices to their ancestors at the mouths of sacred caverns. The deep respect that was held for ancestors is one reason why grave robbery and the despoliation of Turkic tombs was punished so severely. A kurgan, mound or cairn of stones was erected so that the departed spirit would have a place to call its own. Sometimes stone statues (called balbal) were also set up. Only animals, however, were sacrificed to Tangri and ancestors. Human sacrifice was never practiced among the Turks. Only males were chosen as sacrificial animals, and the most valuable of these was of course the horse. Skeletons of sacrificed horses are found frequently in steppe lander Turkic tombs everywhere, from the empire of the Asian Huns to the Hun-Avar tombs of Central Asia.

The third element was the worship of the sky god. This was the fundamental creed of the ancient Turks, and in this particular form appears only among them. In this system of belief, the sky god (Tangri, Tengri) is the Supreme Being, the central object of all worship, the source of all power. The Old Turks followed a religious tradition that blended shamanism with what Western scholars have named «Tengrism», a faith worshiping Heaven (Türk. Tengri) as the supreme God and venerating certain mountains as seats of power. Tengrism was never an organized religion and appeared in several forms among almost all the peoples of the Central Asian steppes – Türk, Mongol, and Tangut alike. In its Turkic form, it supported the Turkic social structure, which was built on the basis of a hierarchy of tribes. One tribe is dominant and its chief is the source of a hereditary line of rulers for all. The Turkic form of Tengrism, then, regards any Turkic chief controlling Otukan as supreme ruler (Türk. qaghan) of all Turkic tribes and embodiment of society's fortune. If Turkic society's fortune declined, the Khagan was accountable and could even be sacrificed. His son would then succeed to his position.

The principle beliefs and practices of the Tangri cult can be more or less determined by a study of Chinese sources and the Orkhon monuments. In a letter sent to the Chinese emperor by Mo-tun, the ruler of the Asian Huns, the latter notes that he had been elevated to the throne by Tangri and that his military victories were won first and foremost by virtue of the sky god's grace. Another Hun ruler, having escaped a trap set for him by the Chinese in 133 B.C.

declared that his deliverance had been the will of Tangri, who watched over him and ensured his success. A Turkish ruler in 328 is reported as raising his arms to the heavens upon having achieved a success and saying «O Sky (Kok)... Thanks be to thee!» In the treaty between the Avar the Khagan and the Byzantine emperor, the former swore to uphold the agreement in the name of Kok-Tangri. After a victorious battle in 598 or 599, the Blue Türk (KokTürk) the Khagan Tardu dismounted, addressed the sky and proclaimed his thanks. According to the inscriptions on the Orkhon monuments, Tangri was the creator of the universe. The Blue Turks believed that their empire's formation was a consequence of the sky god's wishes and that their khagan had been sent to them by their god. In other words, Tangri took a personal interest in the independent existence of the Turks. Victory in the battle was a consequence of Tangri's will. Tangri intervened directly in the lives of the Turks and of people in general. He commanded and punished the disobedient. Tangri bestowed fortune and retracted it from those who were unworthy. It was Tangri who broke the light of day at dawn and who fused vegetation with life. Death was also dependent upon his will. Tangri granted life and could take it back whenever he wished: «When his time came, Kul Tegin died. Human beings are created to die. Law and right come from Tangri. He joins that which is broken and mends that which is torn».

The progress of the development of the concept of Tangri among the Turks from that of the physical sense of «sky» to a supreme being is interesting. In the Orkhon inscriptions there is a sentence that sums up the Turkish cosmogony in a nutshell: «Uze kok Tengri, asra yagiz yer kilindikta ikin ara kisi ogli kilinis» (When almighty Kok-tangri formed the dark yonder-earth, he also created man). To these early steppe landers the vast over-arching sky seemed to embrace everything from the phenomenal rising and setting of the sun and moon to the regular movements of the stars; from the unchanging cycle of the seasons to rain, snow, and wind; the heat of the day and the cold of the night; the quickening of vegetation in spring and its desiccation in summer; the sudden flowing of streams and their dying up; the birth and growth of animals in an invariable order and balance whose harmony was so perfect that it was

inconceivable to the mind of man, and it was only natural that they should have regarded it as a supreme being. In addition to the absolute might of Tangri's immortality, Tangri also acquired the attribute of being everywhere at all times and of being incapable of being represented physically.

It has also been asserted that totemism was practiced among the early Turks; however, recent investigations have disproved this allegation. Researchers working in Siberia and Mongolia during the second half of the 19th century put forth an assertion that the early Turks were originally shamanists. Although incorrect, this notion became widespread and still persists.

In the course of their long history and wanderings, Turkish groups came into contact with many other religions prior to Islam. Some groups in China adopted Buddhism. The Danube Bulgars opted for Christianity. Judaism was popular with the Khazars. The Uighurs adopted Buddhism and Manichaeanism. The consequences for Turkish identity were not always providential since these groups were eventually assimilated into the larger communities.

Buddhism earlier than all great religions became popular in the first Turk khaganate aristocratic environment. The third son of Bumen (Il-Qağan) and Wei Chang'le, and the fourth khagan of the Gokturk khaganate Taspar reigned from 572-581. Unlike his father and older brothers he embraced chinese culture, especially Buddhism. He was converted to this religion by the Qi monk Huilin, for whom he built a pagoda. It is known from the Bugut inscription (VI c.) at court of Taspar khagan lived Sogdians-Buddhists. The Bugut inscription itself was written with the script typical for Buddhist sutrs. The khaganate rulers saw in Buddhism a universal form, that could help to creating a certain ideological community in the heterogeneous power. However, a social-political crisis in the khaganate begun in 581 г. Halted this process. In the west and east of the khaganate Buddhism was kept for some time. Some spreading Buddhism got among the Yenisei Kyrghyz and the Kimaks. One of the princes of the Yenisei Kyrghyz princely house even became a Buddhist monk, settled in one of the Buddhist monastery of Eastern Turkestan and translated sacred texts from Tibetan into Turkic.

A bronze mirror with a runic inscription found in a burial place of a Kimak woman in Eastern Kazakhstan, was decorated with a Buddhist maxim in the Turkic language. However only the Uighurs of Eastern Turkestan adopted Buddhism as a state religion and created the richest heritage of Buddhist texts translations, written in India, Tibet, Eastern Turkestan. Another religion spread among the Turks was Manichaeism. Manichaeism (Manichaeanism), dualistic religious movement founded in Persia in the 3rd century ad by Mani, who was known as the «Apostle of Light» and supreme «Illuminator». Although Manichaeism was long considered a Christian heresy, it was a religion in its own right that, because of the coherence of its doctrines and the rigidness of its structure and institutions, preserved throughout its history a unity and unique character. Mani was born in southern Babylonia (now in Iraq). With his «annunciation» at the age of 24, he obeyed a heavenly order to manifest himself publicly and to proclaim his doctrines; thus began the new religion. From that point on, Mani preached throughout the Persian Empire. At first unhindered, he later was opposed by the king, condemned, and imprisoned. After 26 days of trials, which his followers called the «Passion of the Illuminator» or Mani's «crucifixion», Mani delivered a final message to his disciples and died (sometime between 274 and 277). Mani viewed himself as the final successor in a long line of prophets, beginning with Adam and including Buddha, Zoroaster, and Jesus. He viewed earlier revelations of the true religion as being limited in effectiveness because they were local, taught in one language to one people. Moreover, later adherents lost sight of the original truth. Mani regarded himself as the carrier of a universal message destined to replace all other religions. Hoping to avoid corruption and to ensure doctrinal unity, he recorded his teachings in writing and gave those writings canonical status during his lifetime.

The Manichaean Church from the beginning was dedicated to vigorous missionary activity in an attempt to convert the world. Mani encouraged the translation of his writings into other languages and organized an extensive mission program. Manichaeism rapidly spread west into the Roman Empire. From Egypt it moved across northern Africa (where the young Augustine temporarily became a

convert) and reached Rome in the early 4th century. The 4th century marked the height of Manichaean expansion in the West, with churches established in southern Gaul and Spain. Vigorously attacked by both the Christian Church and the Roman state, it disappeared almost entirely from Western Europe by the end of the 5th century, and, during the course of the 6th century, from the eastern portion of the Empire. During the lifetime of Mani, Manichaeism spread to the eastern provinces of the Persian Sāsānian Empire. Within Persia itself, the Manichaean community maintained it self in spite of severe persecutions, until Muslim' Abbāsid persecution in the 10th century forced the transfer of the seat of the Manichaean leader to Samarkand (now in Uzbekistan).

The religion's expansion to the East had already begun in the 7th century with the reopening of caravan routes there after China's conquest of East Turkestan. A Manichaean missionary reached the Chinese court in 694, and in 732 an edict gave the religion freedom of worship in China. When East Turkestan was conquered in the 8th century by the Uighur Turks, one of their leaders adopted Manichaeism and it remained the state religion of the Uighur kingdom until its overthrow in 840. Manichaeism itself probably survived in East Turkistan until the Mongol invasion in the 13th century. In China it was forbidden in 843, but, although persecuted, it continued there at least until the 14th century. Teachings similar to Manichaeism resurfaced during the Middle Ages in Europe in the so-called neo-Manichaean sects. Groups such as the Paulicians (Armenia, 7th century), the Bogomilists (Bulgaria, 10th century), and the Cathari or Albigensians (southern France, 12th century) bore strong resemblances to Manichaeism and probably were influenced by it. However, their direct historical links to the religion of Mani are difficult to establish.

Mani sought to found a truly ecumenical and universal religion that would integrate into itself all the partial truths of previous revelations, especially those of Zoroaster, Buddha, and Jesus. However, beyond mere syncretism, it sought the proclamation of a truth that could be translated into diverse forms in accordance with the different cultures into which it spread. Thus, Manichaeism, depending on the context, resembles Iranian and Indian religions,

Christianity, Buddhism, and Taoism. At its core, Manichaeism was a type of Gnosticism – a dualistic religion that offered salvation through special knowledge (gnosis) of spiritual truth. Like all forms of Gnosticism, Manichaeism taught that life in this world is unbearably painful and radically evil. Inner illumination or gnosis reveals that the soul which shares in the nature of God has fallen into the evil world of matter and must be saved by means of the spirit or intelligence (nous). To know one's self is to recover one's true self, which was previously clouded by ignorance and lack of self-consciousness because of its mingling with the body and with matter. In Manichaeism, to know one's self is to see one's soul as sharing in the very nature of God and as coming from a transcendent world. Knowledge enables a person to realize that, despite his abject present condition in the material world, he does not cease to remain united to the transcendent world by eternal and immanent bonds with it. Thus, knowledge is the only way to salvation. The saving knowledge of the true nature and destiny of humanity, God, and the universe is expressed in Manichaeism in a complex mythology. Whatever its details, the essential theme of this mythology remains constant: the soul is fallen, entangled with evil matter, and then liberated by the spirit or nous. The myth unfolds in three stages: a past period in which there was a separation of the two radically opposed substances – Spirit and Matter, Good and Evil, Light and Darkness; a middle period (corresponding to the present) during which the two substances are mixed; and a future period in which the original duality will be reestablished. At death the soul of the righteous person returns to Paradise. The soul of the person who persisted in things of the flesh – fornication, procreation, possessions, cultivation, harvesting, eating of meat, drinking of wine – is condemned to rebirth in a succession of bodies. Only a portion of the faithful followed the strict ascetic life advocated in Manichaeism. The community was divided into the elect, who felt able to embrace a rigorous rule, and the hearers who supported the elect with works and alms. The essentials of the Manichaean sacramental rites were prayers, almsgiving, and fasting. Confession and the singing of hymns were also important in their communal life. The Manichaean scriptural canon includes seven works attributed to Mani, written

originally in Syriac. Lost after Manichaeism became extinct in the Middle Ages, portions of the Manichaean scriptures were rediscovered in the 20th century, mainly in Chinese Turkestan and Egypt.

Reasons for Choosing Manichaeism: The Wish to Maintain Friendly Relations with Tang China

For a century and a half, the Uighurs had been more or less allies of Tang China. They had demonstrated their military superiority to the Tang forces by suppressing the An Lushan rebellion, when the latter had failed to do so. Nevertheless, the Uighur khagans still wished, for the moment, to maintain friendly relations with Tang China. Despite the Uighurs' sacking of Chang'an and Loyang, the Tang court wished the same.

In 713, the powerful Eastern Turk minister, Tonyuquq, had convinced Kapaghan Khagan (r. 692 – 716) to deport the Sogdian community from Mongolia as he steered the empire toward a revival of its shamanic and Tengrian traditions. The community included both Buddhists and Manichaeans, and the Tang court had allowed them all to join with the Sogdians already settled in Chang'an and Loyang. In 732, however, Xuanzong had banned any Han Chinese from following Manichaeism and had restricted it to the foreign community. Eight years later, he had deported all foreign Buddhist monks, yet still tolerated aliens in Tang China who professed Manichaeism. If the Uighurs were to adopt this latter religion, they could maintain friendly relations with Tang China without offending its religious policies. There were additional reasons, however, for making this choice. The Uighurs were intent on further expansion of their territory, particularly into the Tarim Basin where they could control the lucrative Silk Route trade. Tang China had only a weak presence in Turfan, Beshbaliq, and along the northern branch of the route in Kucha and Kashgar. The Tibetans also had only a weak presence along the Silk Route's southern branch. Sogdian merchants, however, were found in all the oasis city-states, primarily Turfan.

Having triumphed over the An Lushan rebellion, while the Tang emperor had been forced to flee in humiliation, the Uighurs were now the heroes of the day. The Tang government had not only lost face, but was in an even weaker position than before to exercise

effective control over Turfan or anywhere else in the Tarim Basin. Although Tang China had given the Sogdians political asylum in 713, yet by expelling the Buddhist monks among them, they had undoubtedly lost the confidence of the Sogdian community. If the Uighurs were to adopt a major Sogdian religion, they would readily be accepted as the protectors and overlords of the Turfan Sogdians. This would give them a foothold in the Tarim Basin for further expansion and possible control of the Silk Route.

The Conversion to Manichaeism

It was undoubtedly with such thoughts in mind that Bogu Khagan declared Manichaeism the Uighur state religion in 762, since Buddhism was not a viable alternative at this time. Furthermore, with its stress on the forces of light gaining the victory over the powers of darkness, Manichaeism would have given the impression of being more suited than Buddhism for a martial nation. Following the lessons learned from the First and Second Eastern Turk Dynasties, the Khagan borrowed the Sogdian alphabet, but not the Sogdian language, and modified it for writing Uighur. He used it for both administrative as well as religious purposes, employing Sogdians to translate Manichaean texts into Uighur.

Having gained experience translating Buddhist texts into Old Turk, the Sogdians had begun to render Buddhist scriptures into their own language during the interim (630 – 682) between the First and Second Eastern Turk Dynasties. This was the period when not only Mongolia and Turfan, but also the entire Tarim Basin had been conquered by Tang China. The Sogdian translators had used primarily Han Chinese sources, the tradition and language with which they were most familiar. With Tang China in such a dominant political position, the Sogdian Buddhists probably had finally felt their identity threatened enough to take this step to distance themselves from possible absorption by Han Chinese culture. Since this Buddhist translation activity was still continuing at the time the Uighurs commissioned the Sogdian translators to prepare Uighur Manichaean texts, and since the Sogdians had already worked with the Old Turk language which was related to Uighur, the Sogdians naturally borrowed a considerable amount of Buddhist terminology for their new task. Popular Resistance to the Conversion.

As a result of the Uighur rule of Turfan from 605 to the 630s, many Uighurs had already adopted the Eastern Turk form of Buddhism, particularly the warriors and common people. Yet after the Uighur suppression of the An Lushan rebellion, Bogu Khagan led his men in destroying all Buddhist monasteries and temples when pillaging Chang'an and Loyang. He ordered the subsequent destruction of Buddhist monasteries in other parts of his realm as well, as far away as Semirechye in northern West Turkestan. In so doing, he was undoubtedly trying to reaffirm the pan-Turkic martial tradition and justify his choice of Manichaeism by demonstrating even further the weakness of Buddhism.

Numerous Uighur soldiers, however, undoubtedly still followed a mixture of Buddhism, Tengrism, and Turkic shamanism at this time. This is indicated by the fact that Bogu Khagan had to force his people into accepting Manichaeism. He organized them into units of ten, with one person responsible for the religious obser-vances of each group. Nevertheless, this mainly Sogdian religion never became widespread among the Uighurs. It was limited primarily to the aristocratic nobility, to whom it appealed because of its emphasis on a pure and clean religious elite who were morally superior to the so-called «dirty masses». Buddhism undoubtedly continued among these «dirty masses» throughout the period of Uighur rule over Mongolia.

Furthermore, the Uighur nobility itself was not exclusively committed to Manichaeism. Twenty years after the official state conversion, Alp Kutlugh (r. 780 – 790) assassinated Bogu khagan for his financial excesses in support of this new religion. Assuming the title Khagan, he requested Patriarch Timotheus (r. 780 – 819) to assign a Nestorian Christian metropolitan for his realm. This form of Christianity, however, like Manichaeism, was still basically a Sogdian faith. Its patronage fit logically within the general Uighur strategy for winning the allegiance of the people of the Tarim Basin as led economically by the Sogdian merchants.

In the seventh and eighth centuries, Nestorian Christianity spread through southern Kazakhstan and Semirechye and later in the ninth and 10th centuries led to the founding of the Metropolitan See of Qarluks. Christian churches still exist in Taraz and Mirke. In

Taraz today there are still Christian families of Syrian origin (easily recognized by their dark skin) who claim that their ancestors went there to escape persecutions, the memory of which has been lost in time.

Control questions:

1. Describe three main points of the religious beliefs in the early Turk states on the plateaus of Central Asia coalesced around.
2. How do we know about the principle beliefs and practices of the Tangri cult? Give some examples.
3. Give an analyses of many other religions prior to Islam Turkic groups came into contact in the course of their long history and wanderings.
4. How do we know about Taspar (reigned from 572-581) conversion to Buddhism?
5. Provide some modern-day site evidences about Nestorian Christianity spread through southern Kazakhstan and Semirechy.

2.3.2. Ancient Turks written monuments

In the VI-VII centuries Turkic speaking tribes of Central Asia being in the structure of the Turk khaganate already used their own script. Necessity in a written language arose from needs of administrative and diplomatic practices and fixation of state acts. The Bugut stela is a monument of the evidences about it. It was erected on the mound of one of the Turk's khagans Taspar (572-581). The inscription was made in the Sogdian language. On one side of the stela there is a text in Sanscrit almost destroyed with erosion. The variant in the Sogdian language that remained a little tells about events of the first thirty years of the khaganate existence. From the address to readers it is seen that the Sogdian script was clear for quite a wide circle of educated people in the khaganate from the upper strata of the Turk society. A great number of the Sogdians lived at court of the Turk khagans: they were diplomats and officials, courtiers and tutors in writing and reading. Their cultural influence upon the Turks was considerable. In those years, when was erected the Bugut stela, was translated into the Turkic language and fixed the Buddiest composition «Nivana sutra» with the purpose of Buddist popularization among the Turks. In the initial period of the Turk

khaganate history, not later the second half of the VII century in the Turkic society added with several signs arose a new script. It consisted of 37-38 of geometrical contours not connected with each other, and in contrast to the Sogdians was well adapted for fixation on wood and stone (with scratching and caving). The new written language rather well rendered phonetic peculiarities of the Turkic language. In the process of adapting to the Turkic language the Sogdian alphabet underwent considerable changes: a) italic way of writing some signs was substituted for separate one; b)under the influence of the forms of clan signs (Tamgas) and ideographical symbols, that the Turks had, and also perhaps under the influence of texture (stone, wood, metal) sooth rounded tracing of Sogdian letters was substituted for geometrical tracing; c) since phonetic systems of the Sogdian and Turkic language are different, not all the signs of the Sogdian alphabet were taken, but phonetic symbolism of runic signs not always coincides with phonetic symbolism of similar Sogdian letters; at the same time the runic alphabet was enriched with new signs that were absent in the Sogdian script, partly of ideographic, partly of letter character. In 1696-1722 years these inscriptions were discovered by Russian scientists S. Remezov, F. Stralenberg, D. Messershmid in top of the current of the Yenisei. In 1889, M. Jadrintsev discovered another one on the rivers Orkhons (Mongolia). In 1893, these inscriptions were decoded by the Danish linguist V.Tomsen. And for the first time were read by the Russian linguist V.V.Radlov (1894). The Orhono-yenisei inscriptions concern by VII-XI centuries. The inscription corpus consists of two monuments which were erected in the Orkhon Valley between 732 and 735 in honour of the two Kokturk princes- Kultigin and his brother the emperor Bilge Khan, as well as inscriptions on slabs scattered in the wider area.

The Orkhon monuments are the oldest known examples of Turkic writings; they are inscribed on obelisks and date back to 720 (for the obelisk relating to Tonyukuk), to 732 (for that relating to Kültigin), and to 735 (for that relating to Bilge Khagan). They were carved in a script used also for inscriptions found in Mongolia, Siberia, and Eastern Turkistan and called by Thomsen «Turkish runes».They relate in epic language the legendary origins of the

Turks, the golden age of their history, their subjugation by the Chinese, and their liberation by Bilge.The polished style of the writings suggests considerable earlier development of the Turkish language. In the literary and historiographical meanings runic monuments are not as united as in respect to language and script. The most important for historiographical study of runes is classification of the monuments on their regional, political and genre affiliation.

Despite the huge territory of spreading (from the Orkhon Valley to Danube, from Yakutia to Gobi), monuments known by now are grouped in relatively limited regions cultural and political centers of ancient Turkic tribal unions; on the regional sign can be marked out of following seven groups of the Orhono-Yenisei inscriptions: Baikal, Yenisei, Mongolian, Altai, East Turkestan, Central Asian, and East European. Accordingly they belong to the breeding the union of the Kurgan, the empire of the Kirghiz, the empire of the Eastern Turks, the empire of the Western Turks, the empire of the Uigurs (in Mongolia), the state of the Uigurs (in Eastern Turkistan), Khazars (Chazars) and Pechenegs. Monuments of Northern Mongolia are mainly concentrated in the basins of the Orkhon River, Tola and Selenga. To this group belong the largest of known runic texts – monuments erected in honour of Bilge Khagan и Kultigin (Khoshoo Tsaidam Monuments), the Tonyukuk monument, the Ongin inscription, monuments erected in honour of Kuli-chur, the Selenga stone, the Karabalgasun inscription and also ten inscriptions of Hoito-Temir, two inscriptions of Ikhe-Ashete, the Kentei inscription, small inscriptions from Hangai and Gobi. Usually this group of inscriptions is called **the Orkhon monuments. Monuments of the Yenisei Valley** can be divided into two sub-groups-Tuva and Minusinsk. To this group belong over 70 discovered by now inscriptions on gravestones, rocks, gold and silver vessels, coins. **The Baikal group of monuments** numbers thirty seven short inscriptions on rocks reading of which is extremely difficult, and several inscriptions on small domestic objects (spinners). The number of rock inscriptions can be increased if to consider as a runic script the rune-like signs, registered in mainly points of the Baikal region and the upper reaches of the Lena River. The Altai monuments are not very numerous. For the present is

known only one rock inscription from the Charysh river valley (the North of Altai) and several inscriptions on silver vessels, found in burial places. The Eastern Turkestan monuments include four inscriptions on the Wall of the ancient building in Turfan (also known as Turfan) and several large texts on paper from Miran and Dunhuang. **The Central Asian group of monuments** can be divided into two sub-groups- Semirechye, to which belong inscription on gravestones (five inscriptions from the Talas river valley), coins, domestic objects and a wooden stick. Second group of monuments consists from Fergana valley monuments, which include several short inscriptions on ceramics and metal. The Eastern Europe monuments are like the runic signs, discovered in the Northern Caucuses. To the regional group of monuments corresponds their **historical and political classification**. Eastern Turk khaganate monuments to which belong the largest part of inscriptions on Northern Mongolia (the Orkhon monuments) and perhaps, monuments of Altai, can be defined as proper and Fergana Turk monuments or to be precise, as monuments of the Turk tribal Union. All the dated inscriptions go to the VIII century, but it is not excluded, that some small inscriptions can be dated with the VII c. The Kyrghyz state monuments are represented with inscriptions from the Yenisei valley and the Sudzhinsk stela dated with the VII-XII c. The Kurykan tribal union monuments (VIII-X cc. include the Lena-Baikal region group of inscriptions). The Western Turk khaganate monuments include both the Semirechye and Fergana inscriptions. Through the upper date of this monuments is defined rather clearly (VIII c.), but their lower chronological border is less clear. The most probable date can be VI-VII cc. The Uighurs khaganate monuments in Mongolia, to which belong the Selenga stone and Karabalgasun inscription are dated with the second half of the VIII-the beginning of the IX c. The Uighurs State monuments in Eastern Turkestan dated with the IX-X cc. include both texts on paper and also four wall inscriptions from Turfan. The Pechenegs tribal Union monuments are spread on comparatively vast territory. To which belong the Eastern European rune, a wooden stick from Semirechye and perhaps, Northern Caucasia runes-shaped inscriptions. **Genre belonging of monuments** is very diverse and allows to make out not less than six

groups of inscriptions: a) historical-bibliographical stone letters-both memorial and also in their lifetime praises of deads of the most eminent representatives of the Turkic, Uighur and Kyrghyz nobility, frst of all members of the Khagan clan or persons close to them, made up by their closest relatives or by them themselves. Such kind of inscriptions, to which belong the Khoshoo Tsaidam Stelae, the Tonyukuk monument, the Ongin inscription, monuments erected in honour of Kuli-chur, the Selenga stone, the Karabalgasun and Sudzhinsk stelae, combine descriptions of historical events, in which to some extent the hero of the inscription or his ancestors participated, with rendering social or political views of the author of the text, of a kind of declarations, program and to some extent, agitation meaning of which is obvious. Epitaph lyrics of the of Yenisei and Semirechye texts – gravestone inscriptions, described by the S. Malov as «cemetery poetry» of the Ancient Turk epoch. These as a rule, short inscriptions written on the certain standards and contain mentions of the hero's name and title, his age, several the most important events of his life (without description of the environment, these events were connected with and vital good things, that deceased «had not enjoyed»). Memorable inscriptions on rocks, stones and structures marking some vent in their authors's life (ten inscriptions of Hoito-Temir, the Kentei inscription, the Charysh inscription, the inscription Tonyukuk mausoleum). Sometimes inscriptions of such kind contain only several words, telling about the object or mentioning the author's relation to it. Magic and religious texts (on a paper) from Eastern Turkestan, to which belong the Eastern Turkestan runes on paper – «The book of fortunetelling» – the treatise about magic properties of stones, fragments of the treatise of Manichaean content. Legal documents on paper from Dunhuan and Turfan were defined as separate group. And the last group of this classification is marks on household objects-inscriptions on metal vessels and mirrows, ceramics, coins. Such a kind of marks usually contain the owner or master's name, good wishes or data connected with functional purpose of the object (directions on capacity of the vessel or the coin rate). It is doubtful whether ancient Turkic script was used somewhere after XII c. In Central Asia it was supplanted at first with the Uighur and then

Arabic script, spreading among those Turkic peoples, who adopted Islam.

Control questions:

1. Prove the following statement: Turkic script rendered rather well phonetic peculiarities of the Turkic language.
2. Who, where and when discovered Turkic inscriptions?
3. What classifications of Turkic inscriptions are there in present science?
4. Show the essence of the genre belonging of Turkic inscriptions.
5. What was the history of the Turkic script deciphering?

Task for independent study:

Write 500 words essay on the topic: «The significance of the Ancient Turkic culture in the World history».

Control questions for part II:

1. Describe the traditional religious beliefs and practices of ancient Turks.
2. Define the main steps of the Old Turkic script decoder.
3. Describe the Epigraphic memorials of the Turks.
4. Delineate the differences among the seven groups the Orhono-Yenisei inscriptions: Baikal, Yenisei, Mongolian, Altai, Eastern Turkistan, Central Asian, and Eastern European.
5. Prove the following statement: Ancient Turks were widely included in international relations of that time (with the Hephthalite Empire, Sasanian Iran and the Byzantium Empire).
6. Define the main stages of the First Türkic Empire political history (553 – 682).
7. Which territory did the First Turkic Empire occupy during the Muhan khagan (553-572) reign?
8. What were the political consequences of the Battle of Talas (751) for the Qarluq tribes' further development.
9. How was the Eurasia Steppe zone territory called in Muslim Sources in the X-XI c. Provide some explanations.
10. Make a chronological table of Turkic States on the territory of Kazakhstan after the Western Turk khaganate dissolution at the end of VII c.

Seminar tasks:

1. Political history of the First Turk khaganate in the VI-VII centuries.
2. Students presentation on the topic: Ancient Turks Cultural significance in the world history.

3. Students group project on the topic: How were Ancient Turks involved in international relations of that time?
4. Discussion on the reading Denis Sinor. The establishment and dissolution of the Turk empire // The Cambridge History of Early Inner Asia / Edited by DENIS SINOR Distinguished Professor Emeritus of Uralic and Altaic Studies Indiana University. P.285-313 Available on: https://www.google.kz/webhp?sourceid=chrome-instant&ion=1&espv=2&ie=UTF8#q=the%20cambridge%20history%20of%20early%20inner%20asia%20pdf.

III Part

KAZAKHSTAN IN THE STRUCTURE OF THE MONGOLIAN STATES (XIII-XV CC.) AND POST-MONGOLIAN STATE UNIONS (XIV-XV CC.)

3.1. Central Asia before the Mongolian invasion

According to numerous writing sources in the XII-the beginning of the XIII-centuries the a territory of modern Kazakhstan was occupied by a lot of state unions of Turkic speaking tribes-of the Kipchak, Kangly (Khanglis), Qarluqss, Naimans. And also there were two empires on the territory of Central Asia – the Kara Khitai Empire and The Khwarezmid Empire.

The main part of the territory of present Kazakhstan was a part of possessions of the Kipchaks. Beginning with the end of the XIth century Kazakhstan′s Steppe from the Irtysh River to the Volga was inhabited by the Kipchaks. The historical role of the Kipchaks, peculiarities of their political structure and socio-economic development and also on the international arena has been studied earlier. That′s why not paying attention on these questions, we will consider the political map of other regions of present Kazakhstan before the Mongols′ invasion.

As you know the territory of present South-Eastern, Southern Kazakhstan and territories of Maverannahr entered the structure of the Kara Khitais possessions. The borders of this Empire were not constant,they often changed. After the collapse of the Tang Dynasty in 907 AD the Chinese ruling class retreated from south and control of Northern China fell into hands of non-Chinese people. In 916 the Khitais - a semi-nomadic tribe from southern Mongolia, conquered

Northern China and established the Liao Dynasty of northern China. In the early XIIth century the Khitais were overthrown by the Jurchids, who replaced the Liao Dynasty with the Jin Dynasty. Some time in the mid of the XIIth century the Tanghuts, a Tibetan people, established the Xi Xia Empire in western China. Meanwhile the Chinese rulers established the Song Dynasty in the south of the Yellow River (Huang He) in 906. Thus, during the rise of the Genghis Khan China was divided into three states.

After the Khitais were overthrown from Northern China, a part of their nobility fled westward to the south of Lake Balkhash. There they established the Kara Khitai Empire. The west of the Kara Khitai was the Khwarazmian Empire of Persia, which formed in the late of the XIIth century.

The formation of the Kara Khitai Empire was caused by the invasion of nomadic tribes from Central Asia. It was founded by the kidans who escaped from Chzhurzhen expansions. In the memory of Lyo Kidan Empire they named. The capital of the Si Lyo – Balacagun was situated on the Chu river. Developed agricultural areas of Fergana and Maverannahr entered the State structure. By the end of the XIIth century began weakening Si Lyo′s power. In 1210 the Kara Khitais were defeated by the The Khwarezmid ′s army. As a result Maverannahr was separated from the Kara Khitai Empire. That period the Naimans′ ruler Kuchluk who had escaped from Genghis Khan took his refuge at the Kara Khitai ruler and even had got married his daughter.

Having gartered the Naimans, who had escaped from the Mongols Kuchluk began raiding the Kara Khitai ′s territories. Soon he managed to take the control over all the Gurhan′s possessions. Formally Gurhan remained on the throne but the real governor became Kuchluk (as an adviser of Kara Khitai ′s governor). After Gurhan′s death, power officially passed to Kuchluk who ruled till the Mongol invasion 1215.

In the Northern part of Semirechye there was the Qarluqs′s small possession the Muslim rules of which had the title of aprslan-khan - traditional for one of the Karahanid′s brunch. The Qarluqs′s principality of the Northen Semirechye was the vassal of the Karakhitais.

In the Northern part of Semirechye (also Dzhetysu; from Kazakh zheti [«seven»] and su [«water»]) was the Qarluqs′s small possession the Muslim rules of which had the title of arslan-khan-traditional for one of the Kara-Khanid ′s brunch. The Qarluqs′s principality of the Northen Semirechye was the Kara Khitai ′s vassal.

Before the Mongol invasion territories between the Talas, Chu and Issyk Kul lake were occupied by the Kanglys. Base in the Syr-Darya with it′s fortified cities and adjoining areas, and also Maverannahr with oblast adjoining to it belonged to KKhwarezm Shah Muhammad.

In the ethnogenetic processes of the beginning of the II millennium the important role played the Naimans and the Kireits. As the analyses of the Kazakh genealogical legends show, they entered the Kazakh Nationality. But their appearance on the territory of Kazakhstan was connected with the escape from Genghis Khan at the beginning of the XIIIth century.

If to speak about economic development of Kazakhstan before the Mongol invasion two ways of life have been presented: nomadic and settled-agricultural. The center of settled civilization of Kazakhstan at that time was the South, especially Semirechye.

The Xth-XIth centuries were the time of growth of cities in Kazakhstan both old – Otrar, Taraz, Isfidzhab, Kulan, Yangikent and new – Kayalik, Ashnas, Barlychkent. Just in the Ili valley in The Xth – XIIIth centuries appeared over 56 cities. Till the Mongolian invasion in the south of Kazakhstan and in Semirechye widely spread the monetary trade. Two Monetary courts are known – Taraz and Isfidzhab.

In the second decade of the XIIIth century cities of Southern Kazakhstan passed under Khwarezmia′s power. Khwarezm has been known also as Chorasmia, Khwarezmia, Khwarizm, Khwarazm, KKhwarezm, Khoresm, Khorasam, Harezm, Khwarezm, and CKhwarezm. But Semirechye was under the Kara Khitai′s power and their vassals. Spiritual culture of Kazakhstan a component of which was religion corresponded to the high level of economic relations.

Worship of the Heaven (Tengri) and the Earth-water (Jern-sou), and also, a female deity to Umaj-patroness of the centre and children was a basis of religion of the Turkic people. Along with actually

Turkic beliefs among the population were spread other religious systems: the Buddhism, The Manichaean religion, Christianity and Islam. Especially at the end of the XIIth-beginning of the XIII centuries Islam role in system of beliefs of the population amplified. As a whole, it should be noted, that religious notions of the settled and nomadic population were characterized by variety. In the X-XII centuries on the territory of Kazakhstan and Central Asia in the conditions of similarities of economic-cultural types, languages and life likeness of the Kipchaks, Kanglus, Qarluqss, Kara Khitais, Naimans and Kireits took place the process of ethnic consolidation of these tribes and tribal unions, main knots of ethogenesis, formed historical preconditions of formating nations. At such level of social and economic, ethno political and cultural development found the people of Kazakhstan invasion of the Genghis Khan.

The rise of Genghis Khan

The rise of Genghis Khan was one of the most dramatic in history, and has hardly, if ever, been paralleled in history. No one rose from such a low position: as a part of a family eating roots and rodents for survival; and yet end up achieving so much in the end.

Much of what we know about Genghis' early life comes from the famous Mongol script, The Secret History of the Mongols, which is a record of Mongol history written in 1240. The bulk of the Secret History describes Genghis Khan's early life and is written with numerous dialogues between characters. When the Persian historian Rashid ad-Din wrote The History of the Tribes, he made numerous contradictions with the Secret History, which he had access to when he wrote his script. However, the contradictions are centered on details, and there is a good agreement between the two sources on the general flow of the story.

The Early Childhood of Temujin

Temujin, the one who would become Genghis Khan, was born in 1167. His father was Yesugei, the head of the Kiyad sub-clan and leader of a small coalition of other Mongol clans. When Temujin was nine, his father brought him to visit the Okhunugud tribe. During the

visit, Yesugei met Borte, the daughter of the Okhunugud leader (Dei the wise), and found her to be quite intriguing. Yesugei proposed marriage between her and Temujin, which Dei gladly accepted. As a steppe tradition, Temujin would be left with his future wife's family for a period of time.

Leaving Temujin behind, Yesugei proudly rode back to his camp. However, misfortune struct. On the way, he met a group of men and stopped for a feast. Little did he know that they were Tartars, archenemies of the Mongols. While they feasted together, the Tartars secretly poisoned Yesugei's food. When Yesugei finally returned to his camp, he was already near death. Temujin was summoned back to assume leadership of the coalition, but the other clan leaders were not impressed by his young age. The other clan leaders of the coalition abandoned Temujin's camp, and soon, almost all of his Kiyad clansmen left as well. In the end, all that was left of Temujin's camp was his mother, his four siblings, his two stepbrothers, and a family servant.

Temujin and his ragtag clan took a life of hardship, living off of plant roots and what little there could be found. One day, when Temujin and his brother Kasar caught a figh, his half brothers snatched it out of his hand and ate it for themselves. In such desperate situation, a single fish was valuable, and could mean the difference between survival and starvation. Temujin was outraged. He got his bow and shot his half brother, Bekter, at close range. At an early age, Temujin had developed the personality that would mark his personality when he would become Genghis Khan. Although we often think of him being exceedingly brutal against his enemies, he was also exceedingly kind to those loyal to him. Temujin pardoned his other half brother, and the two would become good friends.

Despite the hardships and the murder of his half brother, Temujin and his family lived on. Temujin had many adventures, including capture by the Tayichigud clan, and dealing with raiding horse thieves. However, Temujin did not seem to be weakened by any of these events. In fact, he kept getting stronger. At age 15, he was old enough to return to Dei's camp and claim his wife, Borte. Without doubt, Temujin had great personal strength, but he still had

no political power, and a private army numbering only five men. Shortly though, this would change.

One day, the Merkids Tribe attacked Temujin's camp. Temujin and his family fled safely into the forests, but Borte was captured. However, the Merkids were a strong tribe and he was in no position of taking them on. But Temujin realized long ago that his father had an anda (Blood sworn brothers), Toghrul Khan of the Keyerids. Temujin traveled to Toghrul and asked for his help. Since Toghrul had such great memories with Yesugei, he agreed to aid the youngster. He raised an army of 1500 men and enlisted his ally, Jamugha, who brought an additional 1500 men. Meanwhile, Temujin sent messages to the former clansmen that used to serve under his father and was able assemble a force of about 500 men. Temujin' army was by far the smallest, but it was the first one ever in his command. The three men marched together in front of their armies and dealt a crushing blow against the Merkids. During the battle, Temujin recovered Borte.

Through alliances and friendships, Temujin was able to hold military power for the first. Coincidentally, one of leaders in trio alliance, Jamugha, was also a Mongol, and had been anda with Temujin during childhood. Jamugha and Temujin became reunited friends and together they gained control over a good amount of Mongol clans. They became a force to be feared, and to an extent it seemed as if though the fallen Mongol kingdom was in the stage of resurrection.

One day, while Temujin and Jamugha were riding together in front of their men (in the steppes, whole nomadic tribes often traveled together as a single unit), Jamugha suggested to Temujin to stop and pitch tent. Temujin, however, «did not understand» Jamugha's words, and after «asking his mother what Jamugha meant», he decided to keep marching while Jamugha stopped. As the two leaders separated, the Mongols were dumbstruck, but it was clear that they had to choose which leader to follow. Some went with Temujin and some went with Jamugha. The Mongol that went with Temujin swore loyalty and in return, Temujin swore to lead them to glory. Shortly later, in a huge assembly, Temujin was proclaimed Genghis Khan (1187). Obviously, Temujin had used Jamugha and

Toghrul first as a protector and then as took advantage of the situation and used them as a source from which to «steal» power.

Almost immediately after Temujin was proclaimed Khan, one of Jamugha's tribesman stole horses from tribesmen under Genghis Khan. This simple event escalated into war. Fighting broke out and Genghis Khan was defeated. What happened next is a confusing timeframe of ten years unmentioned in the Secret History. According to Rashid ad-Din, Genghis khan was deserted by his followers, and was later captured by his enemies. Possibly, he was exiled to China. He returned several years later, defeated Jamugha and re-secured power. Some time around Genghis' return, Toghrul Khan lost the throne in his tribe and was exiled to Kara-Khitai. He was then restored to power by Genghis Khan.

The Secret history does not describe these events, but instead, skips ahead a decade later to 1198 to, in which Genghis and Toghrul victoriously campaigned against the Tartars. Meanwhile, Jamugha created powerful alliances with the Merkids, Naimans and the Oyirads. Similar to how Temujin was proclaimed Genghis Khan, Jamugha was named Gur Khan.

Tension between Jamugha and Genghis grew again. Finally, Jamugha gathered his allies and marched against Genghis for a decisive battle at Koyitan. Upon hearing the threat, Genghis called Toghrul Khan to join him again his anda. Toghrul agreed, despite the fact that he and Jamugha once allies. The two armies met at Koyiten for a great battle but weather became disfavorable and suddenly the two armies were caught in a snowstorm. The battle was called off and both armies decided to withdraw. However, during the withdrawal, luck was with Genghis and he was able to catch the Tayichigud, an old rival clan to Genghis now serving under Jamugha. After a fierce battle the Tayichiguds were destroyed.

The long awaited clash between Genghis and Jamugha was broken up, and the two sides ceased fire. But Genghis did not waste time enjoying peace. He attacked the already weakened Tartars, and in 1202, the long time enemy tribe were finally defeated and put to the sword. Meanwhile, Toghrul Khan was becoming old and weary. Convinced by his son, the tired and confused old khan decided that it was no longer wise to remain as Genghis' ally. Toghrul plotted to

assassinate Genghis at an assembly, but unfortunately for him, his plans were overheard and reported it to Genghis.

Genghis decided to move eastward to a safer location. As Genghis rode eastward, an army appeared on the horizon with Toghrul and Jamugha riding at its front. Genghis was forced to fight. He was heavily outnumbered but was able to hold off the onslaught until nightfall, where he was able to escape to the Khalka River. Genghis' army was heavily damaged, but along the river, he met various friendly tribes who decided to join his ranks, including the Okhunuguds (the clan of his wife).

While Genghis was rebuilding his army, he suddenly discovered that Toghrul's had followed his path and was closing in. This time, Genghis decided it was time to eliminate Toghrul. He quickly assembled his men at night and surrounded Toghrul's camp in a surprise attack. The battle lasted three days but in the end Toghrul was finally defeated. Toghrul's Kereyids tribesmen were slaughtered and the survivors were assimilated into Genghis' tribe. Toghrul himself escaped but only to be killed later by a patrolling Naiman warrior.

With Toghrul defeated, the only ones left to seriously challenge Genghis were Jamugha and his ally, Tayang Khan of Naimans. In 1204, Genghis assembled his men and marched through the Keluren Valley into Naiman territories. Genghis continued advancing until he reached Mount Khangkharkhan, where the army of Tayang Khan, later joined by Jamugha, awaited him. Genghis and his brothers, with his hounds of war (his generals) led a ferocious attack and Tayang and Jamugha were driven up the mountain. Tayang and Jamugha held out into the night but in the end Genghis was victorious. The Naimans and Jamugha's seven Mongol Clans surrendered and were assimilated into Genghis' «Empire». Jamugha escaped from the battle, but was completely deprived of power and was forced into a life of banditry.

With the Naimans defeated and Jamugha's Mongol clans surrendered, Genghis had nearly gained complete mastery of the steppes. There were only two minor groups left to conquer. There were the Merkids, who had regrouped after suffering several defeated including when Genghis first allied with Toghrul. Finally

there were the Oriats, in the extreme north of Mongolia. The Merkids were annihilated shortly after the victory over the Naimans, and the latter, the Oriats, would eventually be defeated later on.

Jamugha, defeated as a Khan, was soon defeated as a bandit leader. His gang of bandits betrayed him and turned him in to Genghis Khan. Although the two had been strong political enemies, Genghis remembered that they were still andas, that «when two men becomes anda, their lives become one». The relationship between Jamugha and Genghis is somewhat interesting. Although they were political rivals, they never considered themselves to be personal enemies. They fought each other only for conquest and control over other people. Now that Jamugha was no longer a political power, Genghis was ready to fully accept Jamugha into his service, but Jamugha declined. He stated that his anda had surpassed him in every way and thus there is no longer a place for him. Jamugha requested an execution and Genghis honored his request. According to the Secret History of the Mongols, he had Jamugha executed without shedding his blood and buried his bones with honor.

The Khuriltai of 1206 – Building the Empire

In the year of the Tiger, 1206, the whole steppes stood watching as the great Khuriltai (assembly) was being held and the implied enthronement of Genghis Khan as emperor of the steppes. As emperor of the steppes, Genghis wanted to ensure the longevity of his empire. It is somewhat of a daunting task, as not so long ago his empire had been a chaotic battleground of many nomadic powers. To do this, Genghis created a system that would stress the unity of the empire, and would wipe out tendencies towards local tribal authorities. The entire population was divided into 95 military units, each responsible for maintaining 1000 warriors. Each of these units had a commander personally assigned by Genghis Khan. During times of war, each commander was expected to effectively assemble a thousand men. Failure to do so would mean removal from office and a new commander from the thousand would be elected. To ensure availability of warriors, every male at the age of fifteen were required for military duty.

Genghis also created various offices of power within his empire, including imperial administrators and the chief justice. Furthermore,

he decreed a number of specific laws, including the toleration of religion, exemption of priests in taxation, the prohibition of contaminating running water, and death penalty for crimes such as robbery, adultery, military desertion, and continual bankruptcy of merchants. All of these laws and decrees made by Genghis Khan were compiled into one piece, the Great Yasa. While Genghis is often thought to be a vicious barbarian, there is no doubt that he was also a brilliant statesman.

The new military superstructure ensured a stable and militaristic society, but was not enough to conquer the world. Genghis went on to make several military reforms, including a decimal organization of the army (from units of 10 to 10,000 men), standardization of equipment, a strict system of regularly performed military drill, and a strict system of military laws. All of these regulations installed a sense of unity and maximum discipline to men who already had a lifetime of experience in horsemanship and archery. Every man in the Mongol army was both a lifetime warriors and a soldiers fighting as a part of a group-something rarely achieved before contemporary militaries. The Mongol army soon became the most disciplined, experienced, and fear less force the world had yet to see.

Genghis Khan invasion

Throughout history of the steppes have always been stages for continuous struggle between various nomadic groups. As time passed certain groups were able to rise and gain mastery over the others. However, few have ever been able to create a lasting empire. In the late XIIth century, various Turkish and Mongol-Tungusic tribes roamed the steppes of Mongolia. The Naimans and Kereyids′ tribes controlled western Mongolia, the Oirats controlled the north areas, the Merkids controlled the south of Lake Baikal, and the Tartars the east of the River Kerulen. The Mongols were located between the Tartars and the Merkids. These groups are referred to as Tribes. Within these tribes are divisions called clans. Note that the clans within a tribe are not always united, as with the case of the Mongols during the rise of Genghis Khan.

It must also be noted that the common phrase saying that Genghis Khan «united the Mongol tribes» is a misleading statement.

This error comes from the lack of distinguishment between Mongols and non-Mongols and between «tribes» and «clans». He united both the Mongol Clans (that used to be a united tribe) and other «non-Mongol» tribes such as the Naimans, (whose clans were united, unlike the Mongols). The nomadic nobility supported the khan only under a condition if war – a constant source of profit would not only stop but on the contrary, would extend. Therefore Genghis-khan became on a way of external conquests.

He had a plan – invasion of the whole Eurasia, to the last sea where the Mongolian horses′s hoofs would reach.

In 1207-1211 people of Siberia and Easten Turkestan were subdued by the Mongols. They were – the Yakuts, the Oirats, the Byruats, The Kirgiz, The Uigurs. In that period the Mongols undertook a campaign against The Tangut′s State Xī Xià, which was finally defeated in 1227. In 1211 the Mongols began attacking the Jurchens′s State – The Jīn Dynasty, which was situated on the Northern Part of China. Here the Mongols destroyed more than 90 cities and in 1215 siezed Beijing. As a result by the 1217– all the territories to the North from the Hanher river had been conquered by the Mongols.

The Mongols in their aggressive policy which was successfully realized during the XIIIth centure had a plan of a campaign to Kazakstan and Central Asia. It would open them the way to Eastern Europe and Fore Asia. It was the reason why Genghis Khan paid great attentions on that campaign and prepared carefully.

After conquering Eastern Turkestan and Semirechye the way to Southern Kazakhstan and Central Asia was opened. The formal casus belli was the events of so-called ‘Utar cathastrophe’. Genghis lost interest in the war in China and instead, turned his attention towards the west. In 1218 he sent his general Chepe westward and conquered the Kara Khitai Empire. But the real issue was with the huge Kwarazmian Empire in Perisa. Hostilities broke out when the Kwarazm Shah attacked a Mongol caravan and humiliated Genghis’s ambassadors by burning their beards. Since Genghis sent the ambassadors for the purpose of making peace, he was outraged. Genghis prepared for the largest operation, he had yet performed and assembled a force that totaled around 90-110,000 men. The total

numerical strength of the Kwarazm shah was two to three times greater, but Genghis ' army was better disciplined, and most of all, better led.

The campaign began in September 1219 from the banks of the Irtysh. Accoding to the sources Genghis led his army from the Irtysh to the Syr-Darya across the Semirechye. Approaching Utar Genghis Khan divided his Army. One part headed by Chagatai and Ugedei was left for the siege of Otrar. The second part headed by Juji he sent to the lower reaches of the Syr Darya, the third troops subjugated the towns in upper reaches of the Syr Darya. The main forces of the Mongols headed by him went towards Buhara.

In 1219, Genghis's sons Chagatai and Ugedei set out to attack the city of Utar, located to the east of the Aral Sea. Meanwhile, Genghis' general Chebe, marched southwestward to protect the left flank during the operation. The main attack, however, was led by Genghis Khan himself, who together with general Subedei, marched through the Kizil Kum desert and outflanked the Kwarazmiam forces. The plan was that the Kizil Kum desert was considered impractical to cross, which made it a great opportunity to surprise the enemy. Genghis and his army disappeared into the desert and suddenly, out of nowhere, he appeared at the city of Bukhara. The city garrison was stunned, and was quickly defeated. Next Genghis marched towards Samarkand, the capital of the Khwarezmian Empire. The magnificent city was heavily fortified and had a garrison of 110,000 men, which vastly outnumbered Genghis ' besieging army. The city was expected to be able to hold out for months, but on March 19, 1220 its walls were breached in just ten days. After the fall of Samarkand, the Mongols overran much of the Empire. The destruction was profound. Cities were leveled and populations were massacred. At the Merv city, accounts described an execution of 700,000. At Samarkand, women were raped and sold into slavery. Devastation was so great that the Kwarazmian Empire itself was nearly wiped away from history. The conquest of the Kwarazm also created another remarkable event. After his defeat, the Khwarezm Shah fled to the west and Subedei followed in pursue with a force of 20,000 men. The Khwarezm Shah died, however, but Subedei went further. He brought his army to the north and defeated

a heavily outnumbering Russian and Cuman army at the Khalka River. He went further and attacks the Volga Bulgars before returning back. As said by the famed history Gibbons, Subedei's expedition was one of the most daring expeditions in history, unlikely to be repeated ever again.

During the entire campaign, the Khwarezm Shah failed to assemble an army to fight the Mongols on the battlefield. The Khwarezm strategy relied on its extensive city garrisons that outnumbered the besieging Mongol armies. This of course, failed in every way. The only well organized resistance against the Mongols came from Jalal ad-Din, who after the fall of Samarkand, organized a resistance force on the territory of modern day Afghanistan. At Parwan, he defeated a Mongol force led by one of Ginghis' adopted son, making it the only Mongol defeat in the entire campaign. Genghis chases after Jalal ad-Din and destroyed his army at the Indus River. The defeat of Jalal ad-Din meant the consolidation of rule of Transoxania. However, the southern parts of the Khwarezmian Empire were left unconquered and later turned into a collection of Independent states. It is said that the Mongols decided not to advance when the sight of a unicorn demoralized their vanguard.

At the age approaching sixty, Genghis Khan' health was at a decline. He sought the legendary Daoist monk Changchun for the elixir to Immortality. His wish did not come true, as Changchun had no magical elixir, but Genghis praised his wisdom and the two became good friends. Following the meeting with the Daoist monk, Genghis returned to the administration side of his objectives. Unlike Attila the Hun and Alexander the Great, Genghis Khan realized the importance of a smooth succession after his death. Before he completed his conquest of the Khwarezmian Empire, he had already carefully chosen his son Ugedei to be his successor. After Genghis returned to Mongolia to finish establish the administration structure of his empire, all the matters were in good order, except for the Tanguts. The Tangut Xi Xia Empire had long been defeated by the Mongols, but became more of a tributary rather than being annexed. However, the Tanguts had stopped complying with terms while Genghis was away. In 1226, Genghis Khan led his army against Xi Xia and captured its capital.

In 1221 with subjugating of the Khwarezm the conquest of Central Asia was finished. By 1225 the main Mongolian forces had left for Mongolia. Only the30-thousand group of Zhebe and Subedeja continued the war in the west.

The Kazakh lands as a part of Mongolian uluses

Genghis Khan, according to Dzhuvejni, even in his lifetime distributed special territories named yurts, to each of his sons. In research literature the territories distributed among sons by Genghis Khan is accepted to name apanages or uluses.

The territory of Kazakhstan entered the structure of three Mongolian uluses:

The most part of steppe spaces of the north of the country and the areas from the upper reaches of the Irtysh to Alakul lake and farther to the West to Or and Syr Darya Rivers entered Juji′s ulus.

Southern and Southeast Kazakhstan entered Chaghatai′s ulus. Besides, outside of modern Kazakhstan that ulus included the following territories: East Turkestan and Maverannahr.

Northeast Kazakhstan was a part of Ugedeja′s ulus, which included the territory of Western Mongolia, the area of the Upper Irtysh and Tarbagatai.

During Genghis-khan′s lifetime the lands alloted to his sons, were for them only served as source of income for them, but nevertheless they remained themselves subordinated to the head of the empire. After his death the situation had changed. Extensiveness of the Mongolian power, remoteness of a residence of uluses from theball-empire the centre on Orkhon conducted possessors to that the local authorities became the valid power only.

The dynasties began introducing an appanage appanage system, transition to the real power in uluses to the descendants of Genghis Khan′s sons raised aspiration among the Genghizid uluses to make their dynasty completely independent, and their uluses Independent possession.

Control questions:

1. What do you know about the origin of the Kidans?
2. Why were strain relations between gurkhans and their vassals in the Ili valley in the middle of the twelfth centuries?

3. Give arguments in favor of the presence on Naimans signs of statehood.
4. How did the Turkic traditions influence on the forms of the Mongolian statehood?
5. Compare the characteristics of Genghis Khan according to Raþîd ad-Dîn and Cuvaynî, Juzjani and Abulgazy.

3.2. Kazakhstan in the structure of the ulus Juji and Golden Horde (the XIII – the first half of the XV centuries)

The formation of the Golden Horde in the Juji Ulus

Until his death in August 1227 Genghis Khan managed to lay the foundation for a new territorial enormous empire, which amounted to earth people, not only lived in the vicinity of Mongolia, and China, Central Asia and the steppes to the west of the Irtysh. Death of Genghis Khan did not change the policy of his successors. They made every effort to fulfill the will of the founder dynasty – to capture new lands.

History of the Golden Horde is directly related to Ulus of the eldest son of Genghis Khan - Juji, which was located in the steppes to the north of Lake Balkhash and the Aral Sea, from the Irtysh to the Yaik. Juji died even before his father Genghis, so the bequeathal passed (in left and right wings) to Juji's sons Orda and Batu. Successor, of Juji who died six months before Genghis Khan, became his son Batu. The circumstances of his accession to the throne were described by Utemish Haji.

According to the decision of the Mongolian kurultai in 1229 Batu was instructed to gain the land located in the West, in the form of compensation for the eastern part of the Ulus, assigned Ugadei (some land to the east of the Irtysh River). But in this campaign the Mongols managed only to reach Yaik. At the Congress of 1235, where the second time the question of the conquest of western land (located in the west of the Ural and Volga rivers) were discussed. Thus, in 1236-1242 took place the western campaign of Mongols. As a result of the campaign the Mongols conquered territory to the west of the Volga River and reached the river Danube. The Mongols destroyed the state Volga Bulgaria in the Middle Volga, Poland, Lithuania, and Czech.

After the campaigne Batu returned to the Volga steppes, where the average over the Volga River had begun building a headquarters – Saray-Batu. That was the beginning of a new Mongolian state – the Golden Horde. It was established on the basis of Ulus Juji and a conquered lands to the west (to the river Danube). Until 1269 the Golden Horde was a member of the Mongol Empire. The Mongol Empire included: Ulus Juji – The Golden Horde, Chagatai Ulus – Chagataid's State, Ulus of Ugedei, and Ulus of Tulyi.

We can choose the following periods in the history of the Golden Horde:

1. 1242-1266. – Period of construction of the State (during the reign of khans Batu1242-1255; Berke 1255-1266).
2. 1266-1312 – the first political crisis in the Golden Horde
3. 1312-1359 – the period of rise of the Golden Horde
4. 1359-1379 – a great sedition in the Golden Horde
5. 1380-1395 – an attempt to restore the unity of the Golden Horde.
6. The first half of the XV century. – The process of disintegration of the Golden Horde.

The Golden Horde was a one of the greaControl states of the middle Ages. Thus, the descendants of Juji ruled a vast territory, covering nearly half of Asia and Europe – from the Irtysh River to the Danube River from the shores of the Black and Caspian Sea to China. The population of the Golden Horde was varied. But the bulk of the population of Golden Horde was Kipchaks living in the steppes till the arrival of the Mongols. Already in XIV century Mongols began to dissolve in Kipchak environment, forgetting their own culture, language, and writing. This was facilitated and occurred at the beginning of XIV century changing religion.

Before considering the formation of the Golden Horde let's clarify the following points:

1. How the Mongols called their state?
2. How did thier neighbors call the State?

According to Mongolian tradition, the head of each of the Mongol states considered the allocation of his or conquered territory as a generic domain, each entering the throne Saray Khans called his state simply «heartland», ie people, given an inheritance to possess

it. As for the name the Jujids' state from European and Asian powers, there prevailed a complete lack of coordination. In the Arabic chronicles, it most often named after the Khan ruling at a certain moment, with their respective ethnic clarification: «Berke, the great king of the Tatar», «Tokhto, the king of the Tatar», «Uzbek, the owner of the Nordic countries», «king of Tokhto», the owner of the barn and land Kipchak, «King Desht-i-KipchakTokhto. Sometimes Arabic and Persian authors called the Golden Horde ulus Juchi ulus Batu ulus Berke ulus Uzbeks. European travelers P. Carpini and B. Rubruk use the old term «country of addicts», «ASEA», «The Power of the Tatars. In a letter to Pope Benedict XII Juji's State was called Northern Tartary. In Russian chronicles first identified these State by an ethnic term. Princes riding in the «Tatars of Batu» and return Tatars. Only in the last decade in the XIII, appeared and firmly adopted a new and unique name «Horde», which lasted until the collapse of the Juji's State.

And among the most striking aspects of the Russian treatment of Juji's ulus has been the designation of its inhabitants as «Tatars». **Were the Mongols to be Tatars? What lies behind this term?**

First it is necessary to clarify the origins of the name «Mongol», about which opinions differ. According to Chinese annals, this was the name of Genghis Khan's tribe. But Isaac J. Schmidt, a nineteenth-century Moravian missionary, who learned the Mongol language, argued that as Genghis Khan brought together different tribes, he had adopted the term Mongol to impart a sense of unity. Schmidt added that the etymology of Mongol signified «brave, fearless, excellent», a prideful appellation.

A subsequent researcher, accepting Schmidt's supposition, has slightly modified his reading of «Mongol» to mean the «secure backbone» of Genghis Khan's power (i.e. his soldiers or people). Such a reading, which seems plausible, betrays nineteenth- and twentieth-century notions of how «states» are held together – i.e., as a «nation». The «Mongols» were everywhere far outnumbered by their subjects (one researcher estimated the thirteenth-century «Mongol» population at 700,000 – at a time when Mongol controlled China had at least 75 million people

Rather than a nation the Mongols were a ruling caste in the broader ulus. The Genghisid principle was the «unifier», not nationhood. Flowing out from the Genghisid principle was the military organization of society, or, to put it another way, the convertibility of civilian into military existence. That in its turn was founded on a way of life, nomadism.

The category of «Mongol» is further troubled by the evident assimilation of Mongol speakers. According to one scholar, Batu commanded 370,000 people, of who maybe one-third were «Mongols». Another scholar acknowledges, however, that the number of Mongols proper remains a mystery. Indeed, the Great Russian orientalist Vasilii Bartol'd emphasized that the majority of Mongol speakers probably returned to the traditional lands of Mongolia (for example, once Batu's European campaign was halted in the 1240th). In addition, Bartol'd concluded, «those Mongols who stayed behind in the conquered countries quickly lost their nationality», as the language of the «empire» underwent Turkification in the steppes and Central Asia. Logically, such assimilated Mongols might then merit the designation «Tatar», which would seem to signify Turkified Mongols as well as other long-ago turkified peoples the Genghisid-led troops incorporated. The Tatars proper were not Turks, however, but a tribe or a group of Tungusic tribes who lived in northeastern Mongolia and fought incessantly with the Mongols (Genghis Khan's father appears to have been ambushed and killed by a Tatar). The Mongols never called themselves Tatars. It was the Chinese, who used the name «Tatar» to refer to all their northern neighbors, and it seems that the European travelers to Mongol-ruled China, as well as Arabic and Persian visitors adopted and spread the generic Chinese designation. Note that the term Tatar was rooted in an opposition – the barbarians north of China; the non-sedentary, nomadic peoples. It was in this oppositional sense that the west Europeans and Russians adopted «Tatar». The term Tatar, no less than «Mongol» or «Turk», expresses political relations.

An imposition that expressed fear and condescension, «Tatar» as a name implied a sense of unity and cohesion within the Mongol realm. Juji's ulus was never a unified or integrated entity, however. Rather, it was made up of various semi-independent ulus led by

Batu's brothers and other relatives. At no point did all the parts unequivocally recognize the superordinate authority of Saray, even if they sometimes stopped short of going to war. By the second half of the XIIIth century, internal wars became endemic. Tamerlane applied the coup de grace. Sometime thereafter, the ulus «fragmented», meaning that even nominal allegiance to a single khan ceased. This produced, in the east, various components independent of Saray (and the object of contention among Kirghiz and Uzbeks), and in the west, several so-called «khanates» (Kazan, Astrakhan, and Crimea), as well as other offshoots, among which was the Siberian «khanate». The «fragments» had always been fragments; what changed was the appearance, and to an extent the practice, of allegiance to a single authority.

Scholars have not been able to fix the **«borders» of the Golden Horde**, or have done so only very vaguely using geographical information supplied by Arabic sources in the XIVth and XVth centuries (there is also a Chinese map from the XIVth century). On European maps of Asia, various political entities are duly noted, but there is no effort to indicate the «borders» separating them. Nonetheless, one historical geographer has pressed forward, noting that the Mongols signed agreements with Riazan recognizing Episcopal spheres and the right to collect church duties (divided among the Saray and Riazan metropolitans), and that they seem to have maintained guards at some kind of «border» with the Rus principalities. At the same time, however, this scholar admits that many steppe peoples migrated, seeking to create «neutral zones» between themselves and the Mongols, a process the Mongols welcomed. All of this suggests that the effort to establish the Golden Horde's borders is anachronistic because they had no such concept. As Howorth wrote, «among nomadic races, territorial provinces are not so well recognized as tribal ones. A potentate distributes his clans, not his acres, among his children. Each of them has of course its camping ground, but the exact limits are not to be definitely measured».

Juji's ulus, notwithstanding its Islamicization, was less a state with borders than a perpetual standing army, an agglomeration of peoples for whom military and civilian life was not clearly distinguished. There were notions of extremities and of lands that were

located beyond those that were conducive to pastoralism, but no fixed state boundaries. The ulus was «nonbounded». Its rule, although nominally exclusive, did not preclude multiple sovereignty (some peoples levied by the Horde could wind up paying tribute to others).

Kazakhstan lands in the structure of Golden Horde in the period of state formation (1242-1266)

The period of State formation in the history of the Golden Horde was in the reign of Batu and Berke. During of Batu's governing were distributed land holdings (ulus) in accordance with military posts, established of the state apparatus, aimed solely at collecting taxes and tribute, established a system of political power over nations that, geographically were not members of the Golden Horde. At first it belonged to Russia.

However, when all the power of the army and the magnificence of the Khan's Golden Horde of the court in political terms was not an independent state, and was part of a unified empire, run from the Karakorum. This dependence is expressed by:

- Mandatory expulsion and sending taxes and tributes.
- Khans of the Golden Horde could not claim the Grand Dukes of Vladimir on the table, and could appoint the lords of smaller ranks. New Khan on the throne of Golden Horde also was approved in the Karakorum.
- Do not have the right to put his name on the Golden Horde coins.
- Do not have the right to establish diplomatic relations with other states, as well as the reception of their representatives and maintaining correspondence with foreign sovereigns.

Batu Khan laid the foundation for the Golden state, based upon solely on the usual nomadic tradition establishing by the Yasa of Genghis Khan. In full accordance with the Karakorum line at the maximum extraction of income from the subject population, it begins to emerge and develop state fiscal officials. The period of Batu – the only peaceful period in the history of the Golden Horde, this will undoubtedly allow focusing its main efforts on the creation of internal political and economic structure.

There is more information about Batu-khan:

Batu (ca. 1206-1255) a Mongol prince, the second son of Juji' – Genghis Khan's eldest son. Batu commanded the army that conquered the northeastern Rus' principalities (1237-1238) and subsequently that conquered the southern Rus' principalities and invaded Eastern Europe (1240–1241). Batu was the first khan to rule in the Khanate of Kipchak (Ulus of Juji; Desht-i-Kipchak), which he is credited with having founded. His father, Juji, to whom the lands had been granted «as far as Mongol hooves trod» in the western part of the Mongol Empire (i.e., west of the Irtysh River), died before ruling there. Batu is also credited with building the city of Saray (Old Saray, Saray-Batu) on the Akhtuba channel of the lower Volga River. Batu was present at the quriltai that chose Ugedei as qaghan in 1229 and most likely also at the quriltai of 1234, which planned the campaign against the Kipchaks, as well as the quriltai of 1237, which planned the campaign against the Rus' principalities and Eastern Europe. Disagreements over Batu's leadership developed during the campaigns in Rus' and Eastern Europe (1237–1241).

Güyüg, a son of Ugedei, and Büri, a grandson of Chagatai, challenged Batu's authority, possibly on the basis of the questionable legitimacy of Batu's father. When Ugedei died in 1241, Batu opposed and apparently managed to delay the elevation of Güyüg to become Khan until 1246. Claiming ill health, Batu refused to attend any quriltais. His presence at the quriltai was needed to give legitimacy to Ugedei's successor because, after Chagatai's death in 1242, Batu was considered aqa – i.e., senior-ranking member of the Genghisids. When Güyüg was declared Khan by a quriltai despite Batu's absence (although Batu was ostensibly represented by his five brothers), he mounted a campaign against Batu but died on the way to Batu's ulus in 1248.

This time Batu succeeded in getting a quriltai of 1251 to select his own candidate, Möngke, who was the son of Tulyi (Genghis Khan's youngest son). Batu had apparently reached agreement with Sorghaqtani, the widow of Tulyi, thus forming an alliance of Jujids and Tulyids against the Ugedeids. Möngke and Batu then launched a joint attack on the Ugedeids and their supporters, the Chagataids. As a result of Batu's role in elevating Möngke to being Khan and in

helping him to consolidate his hold on that position, Batu had a relatively free hand in ruling his own khanate.

The sky worshiper, Batu followed a policy of religious toleration, but seems not to have been pleased by the conversion of his brother Berke to Islam, for, according to William Rubruck, Batu changed Berke's yurt to the eastern part of the Khanate beyond the Volga River to reduce his contacts with Muslims, which he thought harmful. The Mongol and Turkic sources refer to Batu as a saint, which means «good» or «wise», and in the Rus' sources before ca. 1448, Batu is depicted as «a powerful tsar» to whom the Rus' princes had to pay obeisance. After 1448, the Russian sources increasingly depict Batu as a cruel plunderer and enslaver of the Rus' land.

Death of Batu in 1256 led to the first in the Golden Horde battle for the possession of the throne. Governor of the state in 1257 became the younger brother of Batu - Berke. Winning Berke was largely facilitated by the support of his candidacy by Muslim merchants, attracted by the Golden administration as a tax-farmers tribute. At the same time, he found support for the Muslim clergy of KKhwarezm, who wanted to see on the throne not a pagan, but a supporter of the Muslim religion. New Khan took the throne at the age of about 50. Age of Berke was quite stormy and eventful, both in the inner life of the state and in the foreign policy arena.

- New Khan in his youth was converted to Islam and, therefore, immediately after accession to the throne declared Islam the state religion. This caused resistance nomadic aristocracy. Meanwhile, Khan began to pursue vigorously Islamization of the country. He invited from Iran to Egypt, priests, known theologians and scholars. At the same time from KKhwarezm were delivered new parties of artisans, builders and artists. Thanks to their labors the cities of the Golden Horde dramatically change their appearance.
- When Berke began the process of disintegration of the Mongol Empire. Berke's striving to transform ulus Juji as an independent state. It was reflected in coinage.When the Golden Horde was dependent on the native yurt, as it was when Batu, Golden coin minted with the name of the Great Khan Mengu. Berke also minted coins with the name of the

great khan Arigbuga. But as soon as Kubilai Khan became the Great Khan, Berke refused to mint coins with the name of the Great Khan, which was tantamount to a denial of the supreme power of Kubilai. At the same time the independence of the ulus was not recognized by the rest of the Mongol princes, so Berke was minted the coins with the name of the last caliph Nasir al-din, emphasizing that he Berke recognized only the spiritual power of the caliphs.

– During the reign of Berke in 1263 began a war with their relatives - the Khulaguids who settled in Iran. Both branches of a single clan Genghisids not share a very rich and very attractive for nomadic province of Azerbaijan. In the heated struggle Golden Horde was supported by Mamluk Egypt, fearing the expansion of Khulaguids in the direction of their possessions. Throughout the conflict, none of the parties failed to achieve decisive advantage, even though the Golden Horde was able to capture the capital of Iran, Tabriz. Berke himself died in 1266 under Tbilisi during one of the campaigns against Khulaguids.

During Batu and Berke's reign Golden Horde not only fully took shape as a state with all attributes of power and social structure, but also entered into steady economic relations with Asian and European countries, as well as developed strategic directions for foreign policy interests. We can say that in the subsequent history of the state continued deepening and developing all aspects of its internal and foreign policy lay down by the founders.

There is more information about Berke-khan:

Berke, Khan of the Kipchak Khanate from 1257 to 1267. He was a grandson of Genghis Khan, third son of Juji, and younger brother of Batu. William Rubruck tells us that Berke converted to Islam but does not provide a date. This evidence conflicts with that of the Persian historian Juzjani, who says Berke was raised from infancy as a Muslim. It also conflicts with the evidence of Abu ’l-Ghazi, who says that Berke adopted Islam after he became khan. In this regard, William has been generally taken as the most reliable source of the three, for he also remarks that Berke’s *yurt* was originally in the southern part of the Khanate where Muslims from

Turkey and Persia passed. Subsequently, after Berke converted to Islam, Batu changed Berke's *yurt* to the eastern part of the Khanate beyond the Volga River to reduce his contacts with Muslims, which he thought harmful.

The date generally assigned for Berke's accession to the khanship (1257) is based on two considerations:

(1) Berke succeeded Ulaghchi, the son of Batu; and (2) the last mention of Ulaghchi is in the Rus'Chronicles under 1257. Berke, thus, became the fourth khan of the Kipchak Khanate after Batu, Sartak, and Ulaghchi. Early in his reign, according to Juzjani, Berke traveled to Bukhara and honored the learned men there. He also ordered to punish Christians in Samarkand and the destruction of their churches for mistreating Muslims in the town. Although he was the first khan of the Kipchak Khanate to be a Muslim, he continued the Mongols' pluralistic religious policy of tolerance toward all religions and did not make Islam the privileged religion of the Khanate.

Berke supported Arigh Boke in his struggle (1260–1264) with Kubilai Khan. When Prince Alaghu revolted against Arigh Boke, he took over Khwarezm and drove Berke's officals away. W. Barthold argues that the destruction of a 5000-man division of Berke's, described by Wassaf, was not the work of Kubilai's forces nor those of Khulagu (as C. d'Ohsson suggests) but of Alaghu. Berke later supported Khaidu against Alaghu and by extension against Kubilai.

Berke seems to have had few direct dealings with the Rus' lands except to promote religious tolerance, to send tax collectors there, and to commandeer Rus' troops to send to his ally, the Mamluks in Egypt. When an uprising of townspeople against Berke's tax collectors in Rus'had to be put down with Khanate troops, Alexander Nevskii went to Berke, either on his own initiative or because he was summoned, and pleaded for leniency for the perpetrators. It was on his way back from his meeting with Berke that Alexander Nevskii died in Gorodets in 1263.

From 1262 on, Berke fought the Ilkhanate of Khulagu until the latter's death in 1265, and then continued fighting Khulagu's successor, Abaqa, until Berke's own death in January 1267. During the period 1264-1265, as a part of this Kipchak Khanate-Ilkhanate

war, Berke formed an alliance with the Mamluk sultan in Egypt while Khulagu formed an alliance with the Byzantine Empire. This brief period represented one of the few occasions during the two-and-a-half centuries of the Kipchak Khanate's existence that it was not on friendly terms with the Byzantine Empire.

Control questions:

1. What are the signs of the Golden Horde dependent status on the Mongol Empire during Batu and Berke reign?
2. Who supported Berke in his accession to the throne of the Golden Horde"?
3. What can you say about the Berke's attempts of of the Golden Horde's Islamization?
4. The Mongol Empire's state during the reign of Berke in the Golden Horde
5. What are the reasons of the war of Juji with their relatives – the Khulaguids who settled in Iran?

Kazakhstan lands in the structure of Golden Horde from the first political crisis in the Golden Horde (1266-1312) till disintegration period (1420-1480)

Powerful general during the reign of Berke and Möngke Temür. However he lacked the military talents of Batu or his great grandfather Jöchi. He led an unsuccessful raid on Hungary in 1261, and commanded two failed campaigns against Khulagu – in 1262 and 1267. In the latter debacle he not only lost an eye but witnessed the death of his sovereign. However he was successful against the Byzantine Empire in 1265, after it had invaded Bulgaria, forcing it into an alliance, the Emperor Michael Palaeologos offering the hand of one of his illegitimate daughters to Emir Nogay. In 1271 he invaded Bulgaria at the request of his father-in-law who was seeking revenge against the King of Bulgaria for a raid against Thrace. Like Berke, Nogay was a Muslim, having been converted at some time prior to 1262. Nogay had three legitimate sons: Cheke, Teke and Buri.

Nogay does not appear to have inherited his own ulus, and was always described as a commander, suggesting that he may not have been a legitimate son. Instead he seems to have carved out his own fiefdom in the western part of the Kipchak Khanate. Grousset refers to a Franciscan envoy to the Crimea named Ladislas, who noted that while the Khans of Kipchak (Töda-Möngke and Töle-Buqa, see

below) occupied the region around Saray, Nogay roamed further west in the region of the Don and the Donets. From the 1260's onwards he controlled the westernmost region of the Khanate of Kipchak, effectively establishing an independent province on the western and northern shores of the Black Sea, ranging from the lower Danube to the lower Don and extending north to the foothills of the Carpathian Mountains (in other words a large part of present day Moldova and the Ukraine). His influence extended into the Balkans and northern Bulgaria. His main encampment was on the River Bug, which enters the Black Sea just west of the Crimea.

After Möngke Temür's death the Khanate of Kipchak entered a difficult period with a succession of leaders consumed by infighting and intrigue as the various tribal factions vied for power and control of the valuable trade route. Nogay exploited these weaknesses by building up his own following and extending his control over the running of the Khanate until his death in 1300. Unfortunately this internal division also provided opportunities for the Khanate's rivals and vassal states.

The Kipchak throne now passed to Möngke Temür's far less competent younger brother, Töda-Möngke. In 1281 the new Khan summoned the Russian princes to Saray to renew their patents, but Dmitry Aleksandrovitch of Vladimir refused to pay homage. Töda-Möngke transferred the Princedom to Dmitry's younger brother Andrei who, with Tatar support, invaded the Principality of Vladimir forcing Dmitry to flee. Dmitry now sought assistance from Nogay who issued his own patent in return for Dmitry's submission and promise of future tribute. Nogay then sent troops to Vladimir to oust Andrei from power.

After becoming a devout Sufi Muslim in 1283, the ineffectual Töda-Möngke was declared insane and deposed by his nephews Töle-Buqa and Könchek (grandsons of Batu's second son ToqoKhan) along with two of Möngke Temür's sons. According to Rashid al-Din the two brothers ruled the Khanate jointly.

That same year Nogay briefly supported his father-in-law in Thessaly and in 1284 staged a raid on Bulgaria, Serbia, Macedonia and Thrace, forcing the submission of the Bulgarian ruler George Terter and the Serbian king Stefan Uros II Milutin. When Terter fled

to Byzantium, Nogay placed his own vassal Smiltzos on the throne. In the winter of 1285-86 Nogay waged a joint campaign with Töle-Buqa against Hungary, which was under the rule of Ladislas IV, known as the Quman because of his Kipchak mother. The venture was a disaster with atrocious weather causing the Kipchak army to suffer heavy losses during their advance on the Danube and also on their retreat. A quarrel arose between Nogay and Töle-Buqa with many discontented warriors, including Toqta and several of Möngke Temür's other sons, finding refuge in Nogay's encampment.

In 1287 Nogay and Töle-Buqa set out on another unsuccessful raid, this time on Poland. Ladislas visited the Crimea in the very same year and discovered that Nogay was perceived to have equal rank with Töle-Buqa.

It was Töle-Buqa's insistence on trying to recover the pasturelands of Azerbaijan from the Ilkhans that led to his downfall. His first attempt in 1288 was a failure, as was his second attempt in 1290. With his reputation shattered he was challenged by Toqta, Möngke Temür's capable son. Töle-Buqa attempted to have Toqta arrested but he escaped to find sanctuary at Nogay's encampment. In 1291 the ruthless Nogay hatched a plot to capture Töle-Buqa, handing him over to Toqta to be assassinated, thereby making way for Toqta to be installed on the throne as Nogay's puppet.

However Toqta had a mind of his own and he would eventually restore peace and order to the Khanate. His period of governance, coupled with that of his nephew Uzbek, would go down as the Golden Age of the Khanate of Kipchak. Toqta's first challenge came from three Russian princes – Dmitry Aleksandrovitch of Vladimir, Mikhail Yaroslavich of Tver and Daniel Aleksandrovich of Moscow – who refused to pay homage to him in Saray, having allied themselves to Nogay. Exploiting the situation, Andrei and the Rostov princes submitted themselves to Toqta instead, raising their complaints about Dmitry's loyalty. Nogay refused to obey Toqta's summons to Saray. In 1293 Toqta staged his first campaign against Nogay, also sending forces to Vladimir to oust Dmitry and install Andrei. Dmitry fled and died the following year, permitting Andrei to rule as the legitimate prince.

The final showdown between Toqta and Nogay is described in different ways by different sources - Marco Polo picked up part of the story while imprisoned in Genoa in 1299; Rashid al-Din's account dates from 1307, while the Arabic author Al-Nuwayri produced his enormous encyclopaedia in 1331. The underlying cause of the dispute was fairly fundamental – by 1296 Nogay had effectively established his own independent Khanate. That year his mint, first established in the fortress of Saqchi in 1286, ceased issuing coins in the name of Toqta in favour of those bearing Nogay's own name and tamga, and some with the name of his son Cheke. Nogay had also assisted the Venetians to break the Genoese monopoly on Black Sea trade, causing the Genoese to complain loudly to Toqta at his court in Saray. However it is also possible that something more mundane sparked the final confrontation. Marco Polo suggests two of Töda-Möngke's sons approached Toqta seeking vengeance for the death of their father, while Rashid al-Din suggests there had been problems following the marriage of Nogay's daughter to Toqta's brother-in-law. Al-Nuwayri on the other hand suggests that Nogay was providing sanctuary to several tribal chieftains and refused to hand them over to Toqta. Whatever the cause, it seems that Nogay was threatened by Toqta and rose to the challenge.

According to Rashid al-Din, Toqta first attempted to advance on Nogay but was frustrated by his inability to cross the Dnieper for lack of ice. One year later Nogay headed for the Don on the pretext of peacefully resolving his differences with Toqta at a qurultai, whilst actually hoping to catch the Khan before he had time to rally his forces. Toqta hastily gathered his army and engaged Nogay in battle at Bakhtiyar on the east bank of the Don, but was heavily defeated and forced to retreat to Saray. Whilst the location of the battle may be uncertain, with Marco Polo mentioning the Plain of Nerghi and Al-Nuwayri the alternative site of Yacssi, it must have taken place in the winter of 1296/97 since news of Toqta's major defeat reached Makrizi in Cairo in February-March 1298.

Nogay now sent his grandson to the wealthy Genoese ports of Sudaq and Caffa in the Crimea to collect tribute. After the grandson was assassinated, Nogay led a punitive expedition against the Genoese, taking booty and many prisoners. The Genoese then sought

a settlement, which required the return of the captured prisoners. However this caused splits to emerge in Nogay's camp, with some princes proposing to side with Toqta in return for an amnesty, offering to raise Teke as their Khan if only he would join them. When Teke went to negotiate with the dissidents he was captured, forcing Cheke to purge the radicals and decapitate one of their leaders. The incident left a feeling of distrust between the two brothers and when Cheke made a failed attempt to have Teke killed it caused a revolt amongst some of his military leaders.

When news of these divisions reached Toqta he gathered his reinforcements and crossed the Dnieper with a huge army approaching Nogay's encampment on the River Bug. While Nogay attempted to parley, his son Cheke attempted to outflank the enemy. Informed of the intrigue, Toqta ordered his troops to engage with Nogay's supporters. The battle of Kügenlik resulted in many casualties and Nogay's forces were trounced. Nogay was finally beheaded by a Rus soldier whilst his sons retreated to the country of the Keler and the Bashkirs (Hungary). Al-Nuwayri dates this final battle to 1299.

This defeat had profound consequences for Nogay's sons and supporters. Cheke immediately laid claim to his father's domains but was forced to seek refuge with the as or Alans to avoid being captured by his pursuers. Cheke had earlier married one of George Terter's daughters and decided to head for Bulgaria with his supporters, where he joined forces with his brother-in-law Svetoslav. Marching into Tarnavo in late 1299 Cheke ousted the temporary ruler Ivan II and placed himself on the Emperor's throne with Svetoslav installed his deputy. It was here that he was approached by his mother and brother Teke, who proposed that he make a peace deal with Toqta, an idea that so outraged him that he had them both murdered, creating a further schism through the ranks of Nogay's ruling tribe. Fearing reprisals from Toqta, Svetoslav finally deposed Cheke in 1300 and had him strangled in prison. After receiving Cheke's head, Toqta installed Svetoslav as the new Emperor.

Nogay's former appanage had been divided amongst Toqta's family, the largest part going to his brother Serai Bugha. Although two of Nogay's sons were dead, Buri was still seeking revenge for the death of his brothers and father. In 1301 Buri persuaded Serai

Bugha to rebel against Toqta, but the plot was uncovered and Buri and Serai Bugha were both killed, Serai Bugha's territories now passing to one of Toqta's sons. According to al-Nuwayri one of Cheke's sons, Kara Kesek, had survived the killings and fled with two of his relatives and about 3,000 supporters to «the country of Shishmen», reaching a place called Bdin, which Vásáry interprets as Vidin, a semi-independent Bulgarian state on the southern bank of the Danube. The Tatars formed a military alliance with Shishmen and settled in his territory.

Although Toqta was finally free from Nogay interference, the tribal leadership of his White Horde had been shaken by the internal conflict and its vassal states had gained confidence. Toqta now weakened the White Horde economy by picking a fight with the Genoese colonies in the Crimea. Concerned by the continuing export of Kipchak slaves for the Mamluk army, Toqta arrested the Genoese residents of Saray in 1307 and then besieged the port of Caffa. The Genoese responded in May 1308 by departing by sea leaving their city in flames. They then established a naval blockade of the Black Sea ports, depriving the Horde of valuable revenues.

Despite the ongoing struggle amongst the ruling families for power, life within the Khanate of Kipchak remained orderly. Thanks to the so-called Pax Mongolica, travel remained safe and commerce was buoyant. Ambassadors began to flock to Saray, Qaraqorum and Beijing from all quarters of Eurasia. In return two Mongol ambassadors even turned up in Northampton in 1307 carrying letters for Edward II.

In his final years Toqta turned his attention back to Russia and considered eliminating the special status of the Grand Duchy of Vladimir, placing all the Russian princes on the same level. In 1312 he set off by boat up the Volga to see these territories at first hand but in August he fell ill and died before leaving the boat.

Kazakhstan in the structure of the Golden Horde in the period of rising 1312-1359

After of Toqta's death (1312) according to the Khan′s will his son Ilbasar had to ascend the throne. He was supported by the steppe aristocracy, practicing shamanism. Another part of the aristocracy,

followers of Islam and connected primarily with commercial elements of the city and Muslim clergy proposed Togrül′s son, Mengu′s grandson Prince Uzbek as a candidate. Become firmly established on the throne, Uzbek began fighting against shamanists requiring his subjects to be converted to Islam.

Under the rules of accession the 30-years-old Uzbek, the eldest son of Toqta's elder brother Togrül, was first in line for the Kipchak throne. In the earlier conflict between Töle-Buqa and Toqta, Togrül had supported the incumbent Khan and had consequently been eliminated by his ambitious younger brother. The latter clearly desired that Tukel (sometimes called Elbasmu), the eldest of his three surviving sons, would succeed him and as a result had sent the young Uzbek into exile with the Circassians. It seems that the ulus beys were divided over the issue. According to Rashid ad-Din some leaders of the Mongol ruling tribes did not favour Uzbek because of his Islamic leanings and planned to assassinate him at a feast before announcing their decision to install Tukel. However Toqta's former advisor, Qutluq Timür, who seems to have been the chief of the ulus beys, supported Uzbek and warned him of the plot. Together Qutluq Timür, Uzbek and Togrül's widow Bayalun conspired against Tukel and his emir, Uzbek killing the former at Serai and Qutluq Timür killing the latter. Once enthroned in early 1313, Uzbek conducted a major purge of the disloyal tribal leaders and shamen. Almost one hundred princes and tribal aristocrats were massacred.

After suppressing the revolt of the nobility, Uzbek for the thirty years′ reign (1312-1342) had firmly held the power in his hands, violently suppressing any revolts outlying districts. Princes of numerous uluses Juji's descendants recognized his power over them, unconditionally complied with all khan′s requirements. During the reign of Uzbek-khan the Mongols restored their traditional foreign politics, weakened somewhat after Berke's death. Uzbek Khan had restored the traditional Mongol policy of playing off the Russian princes one against another, so that none of them could become stronger.

The Golden Horde also took a number of measures against Lithuania, which being turned into a powerful factor in the north-west. The Mongols could not prevent forming this state. But they

weakened it by systematic raids. The Mongols followed the same policy towards Poland.

If to add to it the successful continuation of the war in the Caucasus against the Khulaguids and sending off a large number of troops headed by the heir to the throne for conquering possessions of the descendants of Chagatai in Central Asia, then it would be obvious the fact of strengthening foreign political activities of the Golden Horde. Successful wars of Uzbek′s government with its neighbors and not less a successful policy of the ruling circles inside the country for a time restored the former might of the Golden Horde, having turned into one of the powerful states in Europe.

In domestic policy strengthening of the Golden Horde was reflected in the fact that the Princes, being at the head of separate Uluses-hordes, under Uzbek became an obedient tool of the Khan and the Khan's administration. For strengthening centralization Uzbek Khan had carried out a reform. He divided the Golden Horde into a number of areas in the head of which he put Turko-Mongol emirs, thereby having abolished actually ulus-appanage system of government. In the connection with the centralization of the state administration under Uzbek′s Khan, also occurred regulating of local authorities. During the formation of the Golden Horde, was carried out decentralization of the authority, the state was divided between Batu′s brothers, each of which ruled his ulus as a semi-independent sovereign. Now, when there had been centralized the state, the former regions were transformed into headed by regional chiefs, emirs.

Summing up the political development of the Golden Horde State for a hundred years of its existence, it can be conclude that of relatively a primitive state entity as it was under Batu, by the time of Uzbek′s reign it turned into one of the largest states in the Middle Ages. The struggle of Juji's successors for separation from the Mongolian empire and its transformation into an independent state was crowned with success. By weakening or complete submission of once the former semi-independent uluses belonging to Batu′s brothers Khan's power strengthened.

Relative centralization of the state was achieved bureaucracy machinery, established both in the center and in the regions.

Government of the country was concentrated in the hands of a divan-council. Local Government was concentrated in the hands a local rulers closely related with the central administration which was submitted to the central apparatus – divan – council when under the khan consisting of four ulus emirs.

During the reign of Uzbek was also observed and economic prosperity of the Golden Horde. It was during this period when occured rapid flourishing of cities, but in the thirties of the XIV century the Khan started building a new capital – Saray al-Jadid. Trade caravan routes became not only safe, but with good amenities. Khwarezm, Russian, Caucasian, Genoese, Venetian, Egyptian, German and other merchants became regular and usual figures on the Saray markets. The real source of prosperity of the Golden Horde were those enormous riches that flowed together here in the form of tributes, taxes, spoils of war and profits from trade. Transitional position of the state in a powerful double-sided flow of East-West and taken with Islamic tradition of splendid luxury awakened striving among nomadic elite for changing its, in general, a guite simple way of life for dazzling splendor. At the same time power of the khan himself strengthened excessively, and his authority became unquestionable.

In his foreign policy Uzbek focuses main attention on the continuation on the war against Khulaguids, persistently trying to join Azerbaijan. During the reign of Uzbek dependence of Russian princes on the Golden Horde became the highest. Against Russian princes was used the very real terror. In 1318 Michael Jaroslavovich Tverskoi was killed, in 1326. – Dmitry Mikhailovich Tverskoi and Alexander Novosilsky, in 1327 – Ivan Jaroslavovich Ryazanskii, in 1330 – Fyodor Starodubsky, in 1339. – Alexander of Tverskoi, and his son Fyodor.

Now in Russia permanently appeared the Golden punitive troops. Intimidated Russian princes themselves brought tribute to the Khan's headquarters. The Mongol yoke in Russia entered a new stage, when merciless military pressure was substituted for no less severe, but more sophisticated economy. Finally Uzbek got an opportunity not to scatter his troops but to concentrate them in the direction of Iran.

Uzbek was to rule for almost 30 years, re-establishing centralized rule from Saray and restoring stability. Qutluq Timür remained one of Uzbek's closest advisors, but was mysteriously assigned the governorship of KKhwarezm in 1321 in place of Bayalun's brother Bay Timür. Two years later he was reinstated as Uzbek's deputy. Uzbek maintained the alliance between the Khanate of Kipchak and Byzantium as well as with the Egyptian Mamluks. One of his sons was married to a daughter of the Byzantine Emperor Andronik Paleologus. In 1316 the Mamluk Caliph Nassir sent envoys to Saray requesting a marriage alliance with a Chinggisid princess, a proposal that initially came as a shock to Uzbek's court. It was not until 1319 that Princess Tulunbeg departed for a grand welcome in Cairo; although it seems that the marriage was short lived, causing consternation in Saray. However after the Mamluks concluded a peace treaty with the Ilkhanate in 1323, the influence of the Khanate of Kipchak in Egypt began to wane. The establishment of the Ottomans in Constantinople in 1354 would lead to the final termination of commercial relations between the Nile and the Volga.

Under Uzbek the Khanate of Kipchak maintained its hostile stance against Iran. The situation was not helped by Baba Bahadur, a Genghisid prince who relocated his tribal followers to Khurasan in 1305. In 1315 he invaded and pillaged KKhwarezm, only being ousted as a result of the intervention of friendly Chagatai's forces based in Khojent. A furious Uzbek sent an ambassador to Iran to complain about the incursion, threatening military action unless the perpetrator was brought to justice. The Ilkhan Öljeytü chose a diplomatic solution and had Baba and his son executed.

After Öljeytü's death (in 1316) and the enthronement of his 13-year-old son Abu Said, Uzbek launched an attack against the Ilkhanate, marching south through Derbent in 1318-19. Following the news of Uzbek's invasion, many of Abu Said's forces deserted him, but he was saved by the arrival of his military leader, Emir Choban. In 1325 Uzbek led a second expedition into Iran, which was again repulsed by Choban back onto the Kipchak steppes. Another major campaign was launched against Azerbaijan in 1334/35. In 1335 Abu Said was in the process of launching a counter attack against the Kipchak Khanate when he was killed, possibly by poison.

He left no male heirs, ending the line of Khulagu and initiating a feud for the succession. In their desperation to find a leader the Ilkhanate ulus beys even approached Uzbek, but he declined after consulting with his senior emir, Qutluq Timür. It was the start of the Ilkhanate's fragmentation and decline into chaos.

In Russia, the title of Grand Prince of Vladimir passed to Mikhail of Tver in 1304, but he encountered difficulties with the important commercial centre of Novgorod, which refused to accept his choice of governors. Although Novgorod acknowledged his position in 1307, it continued to resist the collection of tribute. Finally Mikhail withdrew his governors in 1312 and laid siege to the city. Following Uzbek's succession the following year, Mikhail paid homage to the new Khan, only to find that his absence had been exploited by Yuri, Prince of Moscow, offering to take the Novgorod throne. Mikhail appealed to Uzbek for military assistance and by 1316 had regained control of Novgorod. In the meantime, Yuri had been summoned to the Volga by the Khan, where he managed to convince Uzbek that he could harvest a higher level of tribute from the Rus territories than his rival Mikhail. Uzbek granted patents to Yuri and cemented them by offering one of his sisters in marriage. However after Yuri returned to Moscow he was attacked by Mikhail. Uzbek's sister was captured and eventually died. It was now Yuri's turn to appeal to Uzbek. Mikhail was summoned to Uzbek's encampment close to Derbent in 1319, where he was assassinated.

In 1342, one of the most powerful Khans of Golden Horde Uzbek Khan died. During the 30-year′ reign of Uzbek the Golden Horde reached the peak of its power. After the Khan's death feudal aristocracy began playing more active role, although it should be noted that it's strengthening was already noticeable at the end of Uzbek′s life.

The thirteen years reign of Dzhanybek was the period of gradual decline of the former might of the Golden Horde. It, first of all, affected their relations with neighboring states. During Dzhanybek's reign occurred clashes with Poland, Lithuania and the Italian colonies in the Crimea. At the same time among the members of the Juji clan emerged strives which ended not in favor of the Khan's authority. Unsuccessful war with the Genoeses in the Crimea and the

complication of relations with Poland and Lithuania gave an opportunity to princes of the Juji's ulus, not belonging to the house of Batu, to start a fight with the Khan for restoring independence of the ulus.

There are data that the fight of the Ak-Horde prince Mubarak-Khodzha against Dzhanybek in the «Anonymus of Iskander» and other authors, depended on him. His Father Erzen as a vassal of Uzbek «in everything showed his subordination and obedience». Mubarak-Khodzha, who after his father's death became the ruler of the Ak Horde decided not to submit to the descendants of Batu any more announced himself independent from the khan. These data are confirmed by the Golden Horde numismatics. Coins of Mubarak-Khodzha, minted in the Sighnaq, with the title «Sultan Mubarak the true believer – Khodzha, let God continue his kingdom» have preserved. The movement, which began in the Ak Horde against Dzhanybek Khan, the restoration of independence of the former ownership of Orda-Edzhen, was seen in a lot of things – that was a sign of weakening of the Golden Horde, which began with the reign of Dzhanybek Khan. Apparently, the struggle for independence of their uluses also raised Shaybani's descendants. All of this facts witness that in the Juji's ulus began a political crisis, the first signs of which appeared after Uzbek's death. The crisis worsened in the connection with such a disaster as was a terrible «guest» – the plague, brought from China in 1346. Because of the plague in the lands of Uzbek were depopulated villages and cities. «According to the Russian chronicles in Saray, Urgench, Astrakhan and other cities died out so many people» there were not the livings to bury the dead. The Golden Horde could not recover from the consequences of the plague for a long time. Only in the last years of Dzhanybek's ruling was able to resume the war against Khulaguids in the Caucasus, which ended with the temporary joining of Azerbaijan to the Golden Horde. Having completed the conquest of Azerbaijan, sick Dzhanybek Khan returned to Saray, having left his son Berdybek instead himself, which was «enthroned sultanat».

Under Berdybek the process of weakening the state became even more noticeable. The proof of it was the loss of Azerbaijan included in the structure of the Golden Horde under Dzhanybek.

The Golden Hordes, who stayed Tevrize under the governor of the Khan, left Azerbaijan and returned to Saray in two months.

At the very beginning of Berdybek's reign emerged disagreemence with the Venetians in the Crimea, again only settled in 1358. According to a new agreement the Horde had to make substantial concessions in favor of the Venetians. The latters got the right to trade in Saldana, where they had been banned to go. In addition, customs duties levied in favor of Khan had been reduced by 3%. During those years, the Russian clergy also sought large concessions in their favor. By Berdybek's yarlyk given in November 1357, the Russian clergy were given back the rights taken away earlier by Dzhanybek, it was freed from a tribute in church buildings, was restored independence of the church court within the khan jurisdiction.

The sources did not keep any data about the internal situation of the Horde for two years of Berdybek's reign; contemporaries told only of exceptional cruelty of Berdybek towards his relatives. However, the terrorist methods of governance did not strengthen his position: two years later, in 1359 he was killed as a result of another coup d'etat. As Hummer noted with the murder of Berdybek began a continuous run of palace revolutions, accompanied by bloody murders. History of the Golden Horde of this period is dark and extremely complicated, sources – are extremely limited and contradictory.

Kazakhstan in the structure of the Golden Horde during the sedition (1359-1379) and disintegration period (1420-1480)

From the murder of Berdybek in 1359 till accession of Tokhtamish to the throne in 1379, i.e. for 20 years, in the Horde changed over 20 khans. They followed one another with such rapidity, that chroniclers even did not manage to introduce their names in their chronicle records. By that time, can be referred the separation of the Khwarezm region of the Jujis from the Golden Horde and establishment in the Khwarezm a new state entity under the authority of the Sufis. Minting of the Golden Horde coins with names of the Khans of the Golden Horde stopped from 1361. Earlier than Khwarezm, from Saray began separating Orda-Edzhen's Ulus.

Here, the separatist movement began as long ago as under Dzhanybek, but then an attempt of Prince Mubarak-Khoja, who refused to recognize authority Dzhanybek's, over him ended unsuccessfully, Chimtay Mubarak Hodga's brother was recognized Dzhanybek. During the 17-year's s control of Ak-Orda by Chimtai in western possessions of the Golden Horde began a sedition, which turned out to be very favorable for separating the Ak-Horde from Saray. As it is from «the Anonymous Iskander», the last years of his life the ruler of the Ak-Horde Chimtay spent with full independence in the former Orda-Edzhen's Ulus. But under Urus-Khan, Chimtay's son, the Ak-Horde turned into an independent state. Probably, the same independence sought Shayban's descendants in their uluses. Disintegration of the Golden Horde into a number of independent principalities so weakened Juji 's states that khans, being busy with fighting among themselves, completely lost not only their power over their conquered peoples, have lost their influence in the neighboring states, but also in their own possessions. For example, we can recall the Crimea, where in those years the Genoeses and the Venetians, taking advantage of anarchy, could considerably strengthen their positions. Under Berdybek to the Venetians belonged in the Tan only one block.

For the governing of the Dzhanybek's son Berdybek (1357-1359) were characteristic terrorist methods of governance. He practically almost killed all his enemies. As a result in the Golden Horde did not remain a single representative of the male Batu.

In the history of the Golden Horde the period from 1359 to 1380 is called the period of twenty-year civil inControline. For 20 years on the throne of the Golden Horde replaced over 25 khans. In this period, a number of territories separated from the Golden Horde – in 1359 – the Pruto-Dniester country. There was formed a Moldavian principality. In 1361 – Khwarezm region – where was formed a new State under the power of the Sufis.

After Berdybek’s death – last Batu's descendant of (1359) the Golden Horde split into two parts: East and West.

In the eastern part became independent the south-east region (the middle stream of the Syr Darya). In the western part – became independent the Lower Volga region where ruled Saray khans. In the

Black Sea and Crimea ruled Mamai. In Volga Bulgaria – Prince Bulat-Timur.

In 1370 the head of the eastern Uluses – Urus-Khan, a descendant of Orda-Erdzhaen tried to unite western and eastern parts. He seized power in Saray, but could not hold it and returned to the banks of the Syr Darya in his own possessions (1375). In 1377 Urus-Khan died.

Tokhtamish (a descendant of Tukay Timur) was able to unite the Golden Horde. In 1378 he sat on the khan's throne in Sighnaq with the support of Emir Timur, and then with his support – on the Golden Horde throne. Soon he managed to unite all the Juji's possessions, restore the country's strong power. But that fact, that he began a war against Emir Timur finished him and the war, which lasted for several years, ended with dethroning Tokhtamysh in 1395. He perished in 1405 near Tyumen (from Shadibek) or on the Terek River from Timur.

So, in the xvth century the Golden Horde disintegrated. The reasons for the collapse of the Golden Horde were:

1. The ulus-appanage system led to its disintegration, i.e. internal factors of its development. On the territory of the Golden Horde there were historical and geographical regions, that were centers of uluses – Middle and Lower Povolozhe, Dniester, the Crimea, Northern Caucasus, Khwarezm, Eastern Desht-i-Kipchak. The Golden Horde could function only under very strong rulers. When khan power became less, than the power of ulus rulers, they became independent from the central authority.

2. The geopolitical situation. Near the Golden Horde emerged new states, new regional centers of power. In the south and south-east – the Empire of Timur and the Timurids. In Eastern Europe – the Grand Principality of Moscow, the Russian state, the Polish-Lithuanian state, Moldavian, Hungarian principalities.

In 1430-1470 the Golden Horde split into pieces, headed by the Jujis of different lines. In the western parts of the Golden Horde formed the following states:

In 1445 in the Middle Volga - Kazan Khanate headed by Ulugh Muhammad.

In 1449 the Crimean Khanate formed, headed by Hajji Giray.

In the middle of the XV century in the Lower Volga region centered the third Khanate (Astrakhan Khanate) at the Astrakhan Khanate.

In the second half of the XV century in the Western Siberia formed the Siberian Khanate.

In the XVth century considerably weakened Russia's dependence on the Golden Horde. In the 1480 Ahmad Khan of the Big Horde, which was a successor of the Golden Horde for some time, tried to get obedience from Ivan the third, but this attempt ended unsuccessfully. In 1480 the Russian people finally liberated from the Mongol yoke. The Big Horde ceased its existence in the early of the XVIth century.

3.3. South and South-Eastern Kazakhstan in the structure of the Chagatai Khanate (XIII-XV cc.)

The Chagatai Khanate was a Mongol, and later linguistically Turkicized, khanate that comprised the lands ruled by Chagatai Khan (alternative spellings Chagata, Chugta, Chagta, Djagatai, Jagatai, Chaghtai), the second son of the Great Khan Genghis Khan, and his descendents and successors. Initially it was considered a part of the Mongol Empire, but later became it fully independent.

At its height in the late of the XIII century, the Khanate extended from the Amu-Darya south of the Aral Sea to the Altai Mountains in the border of modern-day Mongolia and China.

The khanate lasted in one form or another from the 1220s until the late of the XVII century, although the western half of the khanate was lost for Tamerlane in the 1360s. The eastern half remained under Chagatai khans who were, at times, allied or at war with Timur's successors. Finally, in the XVIIth century, the remaining Chagatai domains fell under the theocratic regime of Apaq Khoja and his descendants, the Khojijans, who ruled East Turkestan under Dzhungar and Manchu overlordships consecutively.

Formation of the Chagatai Khanate

Genghis Khan's empire was inherited by his third son, Ogedei, designated by Great Khan, who personally controlled the lands east

of Lake Balkash as far as Mongolia. Tulyi, the youngest, the keeper of the hearth, was accorded the northern Mongolian homeland. Chagatai, the second son, received Transoxania, between the Amu-Darya and Syr Darya rivers in modern Uzbekistan, and the area around Kashgar and Semirechye. He made his capital at Almalik near what is now Kulja in northwestern China. Apart from problems of lineage and inheritance, the Mongol Empire was endangered by the great cultural and ethnic division between the Mongols themselves and their mostly Islamic Turkic subjects.

When Ogedei died before achieving his dream of conquering all China, there was an unsettled transition all period of passing power to his son Güyük (1241) overseen by Ogedei's wife, Töregene who had assumed the regency for the five years following Ogedei's death. The transition had to be ratified in a kurultai, which was duly celebrated, but without the presence of Batu, an independent-minded khan of the Golden Horde. After Güyük's death, Batu sent Berke, who maneuvered with Tulyi's widow, and, in the next kurultai (1253), the Ogedei line was passed over for Möngke, Tulyi's son, who was said to be favorable to Nestorian Christianity. The Ogedei ulus was dismembered; only the Ogedeis, who not immediately went into opposition, were given minor fiefs (feudes).

Chagatai died in 1242, shortly after-his brother Ogedei. For nearly twenty years after this the Chagatai Khanate was less more than a dependency of the Mongol central government, which deposed and appointed khans as he pleased. The cities of Transoxiana, while located within the boundaries of the khanate, were administrated by officials who answered directly to the Great Khan.

This state of subservience to the central government was ended during the reign of Chagatai's grandson Alghu (1260-1266), who took advantage of the civil war between Khubilai and Ariq Boke by revolting against the latter, seizing new territories and gaining the allegiance of the Great Khan's authorities in Transoxiana. Most of the Chagataid’ss first supported Khubilai, but in 1269 they joined forces with the House of Ugedei.

Alghu's eventual successor, Baraq (1266-1271), who expelled the Khubilai Khan's governor to Chinese Turkestan, soon came to

conflict with the Ogedei Kaidu (Khaidu), who gained the support of the Golden Horde and attacked the Chagataid'ss.

Baraq was soon confined to Transoxiana and forced to become a vassal of Kaidu. At the same time, he was at odds with Abaqa, the Ilkhan, who ruled his Ilkhanate in Persia. Baraq attacked first, but was defeated by the Ilkhanate army and forced to return to Transoxiana, where he died not long after.

The next several Chagataid's khans were appointed by Kaidu, who maintained a hold, upon the khanate until his death. He finally found a suitable- khan in Baraq's son Duwa (1282-1307), who participated in Kaidu's wars with Khubilai khan and his successors of the Yuan Dynasty. The two rulers also were active against the Ilkhanate. After Kaidu's death in the first decade of the XIIIth century, Duwa threw off his allegiance to his successor. He also made peace with the Yuan Dynasty and paid tributes to the Yuan court; by the time of his death the Chagatai Khanate was a virtually, independent state.

End of Chagataid's rule in Transoxiana

Duwa left behind-numerous sons, many of whom became khans themselves, including Kebek (1309, 1318-1326), who instituted a standardization of the coinage and selected a sedentary capital (at Qarshi), and Tarmashirin (1326-1334), who converted to Islam and raided the Sultanate of Delhi in India. The center of the khanate was shifting to the western regions, i.e. Transoxiana. Tarmashirin, however, was brought down by a rebellion of the tribes in the eastern provinces and the khanate became increasingly unstable in the following years. In 1346 a tribal chief, Qazaghan, killed the Chagatai khan Qazan during a revol.

Qazan's death marked the end of effective Chagataid's rule over Transoxiana. Administration of the region fell into the hands of the local tribes (which were mostly Turkic or Turko-Mongol) who were loosely, allied with one another. In order to legitimatize their rule, they maintained a member of the house of Genghis Khan on the throne, but these khans were no more than puppets. Using the disintegration, Dzhanybek Khan of the Golden Horde asserted. Jujids dominance over the Chagatai Khanate, attempting to unite three

khanates of the Mongol Empire. But the Jujids lost Azerbaijan to the Jalayirids and the Chagataids expelled his administrators after his death in 1357.

The only serious attempt to restore Chagataid's rule in Transoxiana came from Tughlugh Timur (who will be discussed below), who invaded Transoxiana twice and attempted to neutralize the power of the tribes. He was unsuccessful, however, and died soon afterwards. When his army departed the region, control of Transoxiana was conControled by two tribal leaders – Emir Husayn (Qazaghan's grandson) and Timur or Tamerlane. Timur eventually defeated Emir Husayn and took control of Transoxiana (1369-1405).

Like his predecessors, Timur maintained a puppet khan on the throne to legitimatize his rule, but his khans were members of the house of Ogedei, not descendants of Chagatai. For over three decades, Timur used the Chagatai lands as the base for extensive conquests, conquering Herat in Afghanistan, Shiraz in Persia, Baghdad in Iraq, and Damascus in Syria. After defeating the Ottoman Turks at Angora, Timur died in 1405 while marching on China. After his death his successors, the Timurids, are also reported to have had their own shadow khans until the mid-XVth century. Nevertheless, the Chagatai legacy lived on; Timur's troops were called Chagatais, and the literary language used the Timurids and their Moghul neighbor to the east was called Chagatai Turkic.

Timur's State (end of XIV-XV cc.)

As stated above in the fifties-sixties of the XIV century a political situation was unstable. From one side there was breaking up of the country to small not strong feudal estates, which constantly were at war with each other. From the other side, there was a strengthening aspiration of every Mongolian khan for taking possession of all Maverannahr. Timur's activity was begun in such conditions. Shortly after he could form an extensive world empire. Timur, the son of Barlassk beck, emir Taragay(i) was born in the settlement Hodja Ilgar (not far from the town Shahrisabz). From the young years Timur was acquainted very well with a military affair and took part in an inControline war.

Timur well knew life of nomad-cattlebreeders, settled agriculturists and townspeople. He was distinguished in a period of attack of the Mogolistanian khan Togluk-Timur Maverannahr. Timur went to work for Togluk-Timur. He handed Timur management of the Kesh vilaiet and he went himself home to Mogolistan. Thus when Timur was 25 years old he became an owner of a not big but rich tumen.

Timur did not serve long to the Moghulistan khan. When Tughlugh Timur sent his son Ilias-Hodja to govern Maverannahr, he interrupted their relations and became a self-dependent owner. It was possible that the breaking-point took place thanks to Husein's countenance. Husein was a grand son of an influential Turkic emir Cazagan. In 1361 Timur entered into an alliance with him. The alliance of the emirs was a considerable force in Maverannahr. It was mainly used for fighting against neighbours. During the military marches (to Seistan) Timur got a heavy injury in the right hand and the right leg Afterwards his hand was entirely wasted away and Timur was lame in his right leg all his life, therefore he received a nickname «Timurleng» – «Timur-lame leg». He was Tamerlan in the European pronunciation.

After Togluk-Timur’s death Ilyas Khoja Khan , driven out of Maverannahr, didn't want to conciliate with his position. And in 1365 he took the field against Maverannahr with a big army. Timur and Husein suffered from a defeat, because of non-coordination of actions. Both emirs left the field of the battle and went away with the rests of the army firstly to the side of Samarkand and then to the south to the Amu Darya. They crossed the river and managed to lose themselves in the Balh region. Husein and Timur’s flight opened the enemy the way to Samarkand. At that time in the town there was a considerable group of the sarbadars fortunatedly to the town’s people. Sarbadars as a social movement appeared in Horasan in the first half of the XIV century and was directed against a predary politicy of the Mongols and their orders. It is not without interest their own names. The names of the participants of that movement were «sarbadary». It means «hanged men». They gave that name to own themselves. They told that, if it is success, they will liberate the people from violence of the Mongolians and their functionaries.

If they do not turn out well they will be ready to come to the gallows.

Sarbadars could create a self dependent state with the centre in Sebzevar in Horasan. It existed almost during 45 years that is from 1337 to 1381. Sarbadar Hodja Yahiya played a big role in the creation of this state. In the Sarbadar state there was its own coin, own troops. They could introduce a firm order. The positive peculiarity of the Sarbadar state was that it did not create its own governing dynasty. When the news of approaching Ilias-Hodja's Mongolians came to the townspeople of Samarkand, the Sarbadars called the people to show resistance to the Mongolian troops. Maulana-Zade, Abubekr Kelevy and Hurdek-and-Buhary were distinguished among the Samarkand Sarbadars. Having received the people's consent, the Sarbadars under the leadership of Maulan-Zade and Abubekr Kelevy became an energetic preparation for the defense of the town. When the Mongolians came up to the town, they got into a made ambush. They suffered major casualties and were obliged to fall back.

Ilias-Hodja was obliged to leave firstly the environs of Samarkand and then the territory of Maverannahr. The news about a victory of the Sarbadars over Ilias-Hodja reached the emirs Husein and Timur. They met and moved together to Samarkand. Both emirs gave the Sarbadars to understand that they approved their actions and would like to meet with them. The Sarbadars believed «kind» intentions of the emirs. Many tokens of attention were showed really to them during a cordial reception. However, when they appeared again at the headquarters of Ilias-Hodja and Timur next day they all were seized and executed with the exception of Maulan-Zade who was saved by Timur's intercession before Husein. Between Husein and Timur there were some differences of the problem for the Sarbadars with whom Timur had had the old connections.

Having finished with the Sarbadars and their leaders, Husein and Timur subordinated Samarkand to themselves again in spring of 1366. Day by day relations between Timur and Husein became worse and worse. Timur better than Husein understood demands of that time. He was surrounded by the clergy and the townspeople who treated his political line with sympathy. At the end of 60th Husein

began strengthening Balh that belonged to him. He rebuilt a citadel Hinduvan in it and restored the town walls. Understending well Husein's actions Timur decided to prevent Husein's actions. In 1370 he gathered well-armed troops and besieged Balh. After considerable efforts they seized the town.

Seizure of Balh and the death of Husein became decisive events in Timur's life. At the curultay of the commanders of the troops (the commanders of the tumens and thousands) Timur was proclaimed an only sovereign. After he got married to Genghisid emir Husein's widow he got the title «Curagany». Influence and authority of Timur became boundless. From Balh Timur turned to his native town Kesh (Shahrisabz) where he was engaged by setting internal affairs of his state. His basic problem was to overcome breaking up to unite separate estates and to create a firm and strong state.

In 1370 Timur moved to a new residence, to Samarkand where became to arm the walls of the town, the citadel and the palace. Timur knew that the country needed strong power that could suppress feudal discords and secure an unbroken trade and flourishing of the towns and settlements. Prosperous handicraftsmen, merchants, landowners and representatives of Moslem priesthood supported him. Timur won round and subordinated small owners of Maverannahr to himself organizing some marches to the neighboring countries. Timur united and subordinated the lands between the Amu Darya and the Syr Darya and also. Ferghana and Shash region without special trouble. It was quite another matter with Khwarezm! Under the power of the Mongolians Khwarezm was divided into two parts: Northern Khwarezm with Urgench became apart of the Golden Horde, Southern Khwarezm with Kiat became apart of the ulus of Chagatai. At the beginning of 60th vague times came to the Golden Horde after the death of khan Berdybek (1359). The self-dependent dynasty Sufy was nominated from the tribe «cungrat». Husein Sufy began unification of Northern and Southern Khwarezm and took possession of two towns: Kiat (a fortress at that time) and Khiva. In 1372 Timur sent to Husein Sufy an ambassy with a request to return the seized towns. Husein refused to carry out this request. Timur immediately moved his troops against him. Husein took cover in the citadel of Urgench and he shortly after was dead. It happened in the

same 1372. The palace of Husein was occupied by his brother Yusuph Suphy (1373-1380). Timur suggested peace to him. One of the conditions was a request of his son Djehangir Hanzade to get married to Husein's daughter, Uzbek -Han's granddaughter. Usuph-Suphy agreed.

After Timur went away, Yusuph Suphy did not carry out the conditions of peace and seized Kiat again. He called out the second march of Timur by his actions to Khwarezm (1373-1374), but an armed conflict did not take place. Yusuph obeyed and promised immediately to carry out all conditions of peace. As a result of it Southern Khwarezm was an organic part of Timur's state however the success turned out temporary one. In 1375 Timur was at war with Urus-Han. Taking advantage of Timur's absence Yusuph Suphy occupied Southern Khwarezm again. Mutual affairs and offences were continuing till 1379 when Timur seized Urgench after a siege that continued for three montls. Thus Southern Khwarezm finally was an organic part of Timur's empire. At the end of 80th Tokhtamish, the ruler of the Golden Horde evidently looked for case to come into collision with Timur seeking to turn off Timur from the Iranian marches. In 1387-1388 Tokhtamish used Timur's absence and attacked Maverannahr. Suleiman Suphy rose against Timur and Timur accomplished his last march against Khwarezm (in 1388). Taking possession of Urgench Timur abolished the dynasty of suphy and moved the inhabitants of Urgench to Samarkand.

Timur being at war with Tokhtamish sought completely to weaken him. Timur saw a constant threat to his state from an existence the mighty Golden Horde. He had three big marches against Tokhtamish (in 1389, in 1391 and in 1394-95).

Timur still accomplished some marches to Iran. In the second half of the XIV century after a fall of Khulaguids's State (in 1256-1336) Iran was divided into some estates: the state of Djalalurids (1336-1441) in Azerbaijan, the state of Sarbadars (1337-1381) in Sebzevar, one of the biggest regions of Horasan, and the estate of Curts with the centre in Herat That estate existed independently for about ten years. In 1381 Timur accomplished a march to Herat and took it. He subordinated the dynasty of Curts to himself. After death of the last representative of that dynasty in 1338 it stopped its

existence. In 1381 the state of the sarbadars stopped its independent existence. It happened almost with a fall of Herat at the same time. The last Sarbadar ruler Ali Muaiad voluntarily, on his own initiative, handed the lands and authority to Timur. To the middle of 80th of the XIV century all Horasan still belonged to Timur. But his movement to the depth of Iran did not stop. Timur accomplished three morelengthy marches to Iran. Those marches were successful and were finished by a subjugation of the whole Iran. More than once Timur went with big troops to Azerbaijan but subjugated it only in 1397. Armenia and Georgia were subordinated in 1392.

In the Indian march (1398-1399) Timur defeated utterly dehliy sultan and seized the celebrated town Dehli (Delhi) and the regions lying near it.

In 1400 Timur began struggle against the Turkish sultan Baiazed I and the Egyptian sultan Pharadj, seized Sivas in the Asia Minor and Haleb (Aleppo) in Syria. In 1402 in the battle under Ankara the mighty Osman sultan was defeated utterly and was taken as a prisoner.

During several years Timur prepared the march to China with great care and began it at the end of 1404 coming forward with 200-thousand troops. The death of Timur, that happened on the 18th of February in 1405 in Otrar, interrupted that march. Timur's aggressive wars are explained by deeper causes than by wish to seize a rich spoil. Timur put an aim to achieve a dominion over the roads of the world caravan trade (the countries of Europe and Front Asia with Far East). He sought to destroy the northern trade way going across the territory of the Golden Horde and to direct the trade on the old way through Central Asia. He was led by just those considerations when in 1395 he almost completely destroyed the trade towns of the Golden Horde (Azov, Saray, Urgench and the others), playing an important role in the caravan trade. Only Timur's death and further political complication prevented to realize that plan.

After Timur's death in Maverannahr an in Controline and dynastic wars took place continuously for five years (from 1405 to 1409). The extensive state was created by the continuous wars. It did not preserve its unity even after stopping the struggle for inheritance. Shahruk (1409-1447) was considered nominally a head of the united

Timur's power. However it was actually consisted of two states. One of them was Horasan with its own capital – Herat. The other state was Timur's state with its own capital – Samarkand. When Shahruk announced his son Ulugbek the ruler of Samarkand, he considered him to be his vicegerent but not as an independent ruler. However Ulugbek became an independent ruler shortly after and stayed till his death (1449). Actually those two states were not united stated. Every separate state was a union of small feudal estates. Timurids stayed at the head of them. When Timur was alive the separate regions of his state have already been distributed among his sons: Djehangir, Omar-Sheih, Miran-Shah, Shahruh and their descendants: Muhammed-Sultan, Pirmuhammed, Ibrahim, Ulugbek and the others. After Timur's death the heirs, ruling over their appanages, looked on themselves independent sovereigns. They were obliged to subordinate to the head of dynasty, Shahruh who was sitting in Herat. But they wanted to have only vassal relations. Shahruh, from his side, did not see them as the trustworthy sovereigns for himself. As a result he tried to change their staff. He wanted to replace Timur's sons by his own sons. He considered that his sons would be more obedient than the nephews and the other relatives. Shahruh began to struggle with the descendants of his brothers: Djehangir, Omar-Sheih and Miranshah. Original reflection of that rivalry among Shahruh and his nephews became Ulugbek's march against Ahmed, Omar-Sheih's son, possessing Ferghana, in 1413.

By the beginning of 20th of the XV century all Timur's inheritance had been concentrated in the hands of Shahruh and his family.

From 1409 Ulugbek ruled in Samarkand; from 1414 Ibrahim-Sultan ruled in Shiraz; from 1418 Suyurgatmish ruled in Kabul, Gazna and Kandahar. However Shahruh made a mistake. He did not settle accounts with his sons and grandsons. It was found that his sons and grandsons were less reliable than his nephews. Thus his grandson Sultan-Muhammed (Baisunkur's son), who became a ruled in Iran, did not want more to consider himself as Shahruh's vicegerent. He wished to widen his domains at the expense of joining the western regions of Iran. In 1446 Shahruh was obliged to go at the head of big troops himself to pacify the unruly vassal and to call him

to order. Even after Shahruk's death (in 1447) the Timurid's could not to hold in their hands the western regions of Iran. In 1453 Djehanshah, the leader of the Turkmenian dynasty Kara-Kojunlu, the ruler of Azerbaijan joined by force Western Iran to Azerbaijan. He ruled from 1436 to 1467. Thus he created the new great state side by side with Timurid's state.

Ulugbek did not also create political stability in his state. His forces were only enough to defend his own real independence before his father.

Ulugbek (his true name was Muhammed Taragai) was born on March the 22 nd of 1394 in the town Sultania during Timur's march to Irak and Azerbaijan. He was the eldest son of Shahruh and his wife Gauhar-Shad. Timur's eldest wife Saray Mulk-Hanim was appointed as a tutoress of Ulugbek. When Ulugbek was 10 he was merried to Oge Begum, Muhammed Sultan's daughter. Oge Begum was descended from the family of khan Uzbek (1312-1342) of the Golden Horde from the mother's line. Ulugbek received the right to get the title of «kuragani» which was carried by Timur. In 1409 Ulugbek was 15 years old and he became the ruler of Samarkand. It was natural that Ulugbek could not rule without assistance. Shahruh appointed Shah-Melik as a guardian for Ulugbek. Shah-Melik was faithful dignity who became the real ruler of Samarkand. From 1411 Ulugbek still became a self-dependent ruler.

The boundaries of Ulugbek's state almost coincide with the present boundaries of Uzbekistan. Besides a part of the basin of the Sir Darya from Otrar and almost to the town Signak was also an organic of his state. The first nomadic tribes of Uzbeks appeared on the boundaries of the state from the side of Desht-i Kipchak in the first years of Ulugbek's government they penetrated there by the Amu Darya and the Syr Darya. They forayed even to Khwarezm from where they were dislodged by Shah-Melik.

Ferghana was also under the power of Ulugbek. The ruler of Ferghana was Ahmed, Omar-Sheih's son and Ulugbek's cousin. He led an independent policy. Ulugbek had to come forward with the troops to subordinate that region to him.

Ulugbek kept lye to the events on the Lower Syr Darya. In 1419 Czarevitch Barak-Oglan, Urus-khan's grandson, come up to Ulugbek

and made a request for helpness against Muhammed-Han, Tuga-Timur's descendant. Early he suffered defeat from him. Ulugbek decided to have his own henchman in the Uzbek nomadic steppe. It was profitable. As a result Ulugbek and Barak went by a march to the Syr Darya. The opponent did not take the battle and went away to the steppe. Ulugbek came back to Samarkand. After the battle in 1425 Czarevitch Barak became a khan in the ulus of the nomadic Uzbeks and later he caught the capital of the Golden Horde. Shortly after Ulugbek was obliged to take the field against Shirmuhammed to Moghulistan. Shirmuhammed tried to interfere with the affairs of Maverannahr. In spring of 1425 the main forces of Ulugbek acrossed the river Chu and met Shirmuhammed's troops in the mountains near Ketmen-Tepa. The battle was finished by Ulugbek's victory. He came back with a big spoil to Samarkand. Shortly after the relations between Ulugbek and Barak became worse. Barak wanted to have total self-dependence and he mainly laid claim to the lands along the Syr Darya round the town Sighnaq. At that time it was an important trade town. Ulugbek declared a march against the nomadic Uzbeks to the Syr Darya. The march took place in summer of 1427 was finished by the utter defeat of Ulugbek. Because of the defeat he could lose his throne in Samarkand and the power over Maverannahr. This event acted on Ulugbek so strong that for a long time he did not take part in marches. Only during the last years of his reign after Shahruh's death (in 1447) Ulugbek was obliged to take arms again. Disturbances were begun after Shahruh's death in Horasan and Central Asia. Shahruh's wife, Gauhar Shad, wished most of all to see her grandson Alauddavla, Baisunkur's son, on the throne of the Timurid's although the eldest Shahruh's son Ulugbek had all rights according to the law. Gauhar Shad did not wish litigations and collisions with Ulugbek and gave headquarters of the army to Abdullatuph, Ulugbek's son. They failed all the same to avoid collisions. Alauddavla and Abdulkasim Babur (also Baisunkur's son) began military actions against Ulugbek from the both sides. Alauddavla seized the district of Mashhed and Abdul-Kasim Babur seized the district of Mazanderan. In spring of 1447 Alauddavla broke the troops of Abdullatiph, took him as a prisoner and locked him in a fortress Uhtiaruddin in Herat. Ulugbek did not

wish to sacrifice his son and proposed a peace. According to the concluded agreement Abdullatiph was sent to Samarkand and Ulugbek gave up his claims on Herat and Horasan. In 1448 Ulugbek and Abdullatiph began military actions again. By Tarnaba, near Herat Alauddavla's troops were broken and Ulugbek with his son came in Herat. In 1448 the nomadic Uzbeks under the leadership of khan Abdulhair invaded Maverannahr. The emirs of Horasan began a mutiny at the same time. Those two events prevented Ulugbek and his son to occupy Horasan. The Horasan march in 1448 became a sudden change in Ulugbek's life. It became the beginning of his hostility against his extremely ambitious son Abdullatiph. Ulugbek retained the princely throne for Abdullatiph in Herat. Thus Ulugbek wanted to show the people that the town and its region, as under Timur, became an independent principality. As a result Abdullatiph entered into collusion with the enemies of his father. Ulugbek's position was complicated. Firstly he fought against Baisunkur's sons: Abdul-Kasim Babur and Alauddavla. They pretended to the throne of the Timurid's. Secondly he repulsed forays of the nomadic Uzbeks to Khwarezm, Mazarderan and Shash. Abdullatiph took into account of his father's difficulties and waited for a right moment to begin a present campaign against him. Abdullatiph found fault with his father's imaginary intrigues against him and in 1449 abolished «tamga», that is mrade in his independent principality. To save the unity of the state Ulugbek was obliged to start the march against his rebellious son. At that time Abdullatiph acrossed the Amu Darya, seized Termez and moved forward to Samarkand occupying the town Shahrisabz on his way. In October of 1449 near Samarkand by the settlement Dimishk the battle took place. Abdullatiph won it. After the defeat Ulugbek was left by many of his companions. He was deprived of the possibility to come in to Samarkand because his emir Miranshah closed the gate before him. As a result Ulugbek surrendered at discretion. Abdullatiph organized a covert court of his father. Abdullatiph became a real organizer of his father's murder but he did not outwardly take part in this decision. The murder took place onn the 27 th of October in 1449. A few days later he organized the murder of his brother, Abdulaziz, and some emirs devoted to Ulugbek. Thus Abdullatiph seized Timurid's throne. The

people hated a ruler-patricide. The antagonists of Abdullatiph made a conspiracy ready. On the 8th of May of 1450 a court-revolution took place. Abdullatiph was killed near the garden «Bag-i-nau» by the urban ravine in the outskirts of Samarkand. Authority was handed down to Andulla, Ibrahim-Sultan' son, from the family of the Timurids. From the first days of his government Abdulla did everything to return a political and cultural life of Samarkand and Maverannahr to the days of Ulugbek's government. However Abdulla was on the Timurid's throne in Samarkand not long. Bukhara nominated his candidate. For this time it was Timurid Abusaid. Hodja Ahrar, the head of the order of Nakshbedia, has played an important role in a work of promotion and in successes of Abusaid. Abusaid appealed for help to Uzbek khan Abulkhair. Firstly Abdulla managed to seize the town Yasi (Turkestan), a frontier fortress against nomadic tribes in the basin of the Syr Darya. The main battle took place near Samarkand by the settlement Shiraz in summer of 1451. Conquerors of that battle became the nomadic Uzbeks of Abulkhair. The troops of Abdulla were dispersed and Abdulla himself was killed. Abusaid came into power over Samarkand and Maverannahr. Abusaid failed to seize Horasan that time because the throne of Herat was seized by Shahruh's grandson, Abdulkasim Babur (Baisunkur's son). He owned it till very death that is till 1457. Relations both states were hostile. In the middle of the XV century feudal breaking up in Horasan reached the highest development. Abulkasim Babur failed completely to seize Horasan by his energetic actions but he could liquidate independence of small feudal lords. His plan was also to seize Samarkand. However his march to Samarkand was finished unfortunately in 1454. The siege of Samarkand continued 40 days. Abulkasim Babur was obliged to make peace. According to a conclusion of peace the Amu Darya as before stayed a boundary between the both eststes. In 1457 in Meshhed Abdulkasim Babur died. The situation sharply changed. Neither in Horasan nor in Herat there was a man who could take an authority into his hands. There were too many pretenders but nobody had big military power. It was found that only Abusaid became the most power full ruler and seized the throne in Herat. Thus from 1457 Timurid's state could be nominally considered united again. However

that unification was not firm. Abdulkasim Babur's death (in 1457) consolidated a position of Abusaid who ruled the most part of Horasan. However his authority was not firm. A young Timurid, Sultan Husein (Omar-Sheih's grandson) gave Abusaid much more trouble who became a ruler of Horasan afterwards. Sultan-Husein appeared at the head of the detachment in Horasan. From 1461 to 1464 he acted with variable success in the districts of Herat, Abiverda, Nesi, Meshhed and the others.

Abusaid soon perished during the battle against Uzun-Hasan in the Mugan steppe in Azerbaijan. Uzun-Hasan (1453-1478) was a member of the Turkmen dynasty Ak-Kojunlu. Abusaid's sons refused to fight with Sultan-Husein and went away to Maverannahr. On the 24th of March in 1469 Sultan-Husein triumphantly came in Herat as its ruler. As a result Timurid's state again broke down into two self-dependent parts: the Horasan estate and Maverannahr.

Sultan-Husein became a ruler of the Horasan estate. Abusaid's sons became independent rulers of Maverannahr. The first one was Sultan-Ahmed (1469-1494), then the second one – was Sultan-Mahmud and at last the third – was Sultan-Ali.

At that time Maverannahr was actually broken down into great number of alm-ost independent hostile estates placing themselves at the heads of Timurid's heirs.

The same position was in Sultan- Husein's state. However in spite of feudal internecine dissentions which rended Herat state, economic life of the country had more high level than in Maverannahr.

At the end of the XV cetury economic and political bases of the state of Timurids were undermined by sharp contradictions among its heirs in Horasan and in Maverannahr. In Samarkand, Tashkent, Andijan, and Hisar there were self-dependent rulers being in war with each other. Each of them appealed for military help sometimes to the Moghul khans sometimes to the Uzbek khans. Because of those discords khans of Moghulistan finally affirmed their power in Tashkent region and tried to seize Ferghana. Those feudal disorders reached the highest point at the end of the XVcentury. At that time privileged «tarhanstvo» came out to the historic arena. Those were numerous small rulers from Timurid's house, the descendants of the

greaControl feudal lord hodja Ahrar, the head of the order «Nakshbendiya».

Control questions:

4. What did the term Transoxiana mean?
5. What were the main reasons of disintegration of the Chagataids State in the middle of the XIV century?
6. Desribe the attempts of the first khans of Moghulistan to restore Chagataid State.
7. How did emir Timur acsess the trone in the Western part of Maverannahr?
8. Decribe the borders of the Timur Empire in the 1370-1405.

3.4. Post-Mongolian State unions on the territory of Kazakhstan

3.4.1. Ak-Horde – the first state entity on the local ethnic basis on the territory of Kazakhstan

Under the Ak-Horde of the beginning of the XIV-XV th centuries should be understood a huge territory of the Kazakh steppes from the Ural River to the West Siberian Lowland, including the lower and middle reaches of the Syr Darya, that was the lands of Horde –Edzhen and Shayban's uluses.

Ak-Horde the first state entity on the local ethnic basis in the post-Mongolian period on the territory of Kazakhstan. It was inhabited by Turkic-speaking tribes, who lived in those lands from immemorial time before the Mongol conquests and were a part of the Kipchak union, and which also moved during the invasion of Genghis Khan from eastern and southeastern regions of Kazakhstan and Altai.

Chronological tables of Muslim dynasties list the names of Ak-Horde khans in the following sequence: Horde-Edzhen, Sartak, Conical, Bayan, Sasy-Buka, Erzen, Mubarak, Chimtay, Urus-Khan, Koyrchik and Barak.

From the beginning of the XIV century Horde-Edzhen's descendants struggled with the Chagataids for the Syr Darya cities

and pastures of Semirechye. Simultaneously, a growing trend to restore trade and economic relations between nomads and semi-nomads of the steppe areas and the population of the settled areas of the Syr Darya oasis. Not by chance rulers of the Ak-Horde moved the administrative center to the southern outskirts of their possessions into the Sighnaq city

Transformation of southern Kazakhstan into the center of the Ak-Horde, with its capital in Sighnaq promoted greater contacts with the settled areas of Central Asia and Khwarezm. The declining of urban life in the heart of the Golden Horde – Povolozhie, as well as the movement of the trade routes significantly affected the extinction of these contacts.

Through the strengthening of economic and political situation of the local Turkic and Turkicized leaders, the rulers of the Ak-Horde, starting with Mubarak-Khodzha Khan (1320-1344) – finally broke off even nominal dependence on the Golden Horde.

At the time when the Golden Horde entered a period of crisis in 1359-1379, the rulers of the Ak-Horde sought to use the situation to unite both sides of the Juji ulus into one political entity under their rule. An official invitation to take the Golden Horde throne was made, for example, to Chimtay (1344-1361), who did not accept it, but his sons, especially Urus, actively participated in the struggle for the Golden Horde throne.

Urus became Khan of the Ak-Horde in 1368 under him increased the power of the khan of the Ak-Horde. At the same time he actively participated in the struggle for the Golden Horde throne. To the end in 1368 Urus made a campaign towards the Volga region. In 1374-1375 he seized Saray, besieged Hajji Tarkhan and subjected the Kama Bulgars. However, Urus-Khan's success was brief and in the following year he had to leave the Volga region. Urus Khan was unable to remove from his way the Golden Horde favorite Mamay, who during the period of civil strife with the support of the nobility of the western part of the Golden Horde managed to achieve considerable power. In the years 1375-1376 Urus Khan returned to the banks of the Syr Darya, where on the southern borders began his aggressive actions Central Asian ruler Emir Timur.

Discussion on the Ak-Horde and Kok-Horde in the historical literature

It should be noted, that in the modern Juji ulus and his descendants' historiography two problems caused particularly fierce disputes:

Firstly – what was the name of the Juji's State in the eastern part of Desht-i-Kipchak – Ak-Horde or Kok-Horde?

Secondly, what was the status of that political entity within the Golden Horde, the degree of its independence or dependence?

The bases for these discussions were data of two groups of sources on the Ak-Horde: Muin al-Din Natanzi (early of the second decade of the XV century). In the work conditionally called by V.V.Bartold «Anonymous of Iskander» and in sources of the XVII century» – Abulgazi-Bahadur Khan «Shadzharat al Atracom and Mahmud B. Emir Wali Bahr Al-Asrar

For example, Muin al-Din Natanzi said about the division of the Juji's ulus into Ak-Horde and Kok-Horde in 1300 ... After this Juji's Ulus was divided into two parts. Those, who belonged to the left wing, i.m. the limits of Ulug-tag Sekiz-yagacha and Karatal to the limits of Tuysen, neighborhoods of Jend and Barchkend, became firmly established for Nogaja's descendants, and they began to being called as Sultans of Ak-Horde, but the right wing which included Ibir-Siberia, Rus, Libka, Ukek, Majar, Bulgar, Bashgird and Saray Berke, were intended to Tokto's descendants and they were called sultans of the Kok Horde.

But Abulgazi-Bahadur Khan wrote about the Ак-Horde not specifically at all: «Let us remind that Juji's khan residence was in Desht-i-Kipchak, in the country, which was called as Kok-Horde». It is known, that Juji's headquarters was in the upper reaches of the Irtysh, and this region is associated in the author's work with the Kok-Horde.

On the Ak-Horde the author said the following: «...the possession in the Ak-Horde he had given to Bahadur-khan, Shiban-khan's son».

In Mahmud B. Emir Wali 's work Bahr Al-Asrar Shayban's son Bahadur set out to the Ak-Horde himself, as to the belonging him possession: «As Bahadur, Shayban Khan's son... he instead of his father began prevailing over the ale and ulus ... he chose Ak Horde

for wintering and summering». From the literature is known the territory of Shayban ulus allotted Shayban by Batu Khan. It was described by Abulgazi: The Yurt, where you will live will be between my Yurt and my brother Edzhen's Yurt. In the summer you will live on the east side of the Yaik, on the Irgiz, Or, Ilek rivers to the Ural mountains, and willlive during the winter in the Aral-Kum, Kara-Kum, and along the Syr rivers, in estuaries of the Chuysu Sarysu rivers.

Thus, both authors Abulgazi and Mahmud ibn Wali say about the Ak-Horde on the East Desht-i-Kipchak territory. It turns out that they called as Ak-Horde Shayban's possessions, while Muin al-Din Natanzi – the Ak-Horde belonged to Horde-Edzhen's descendants

One of the laControl views in the discussion on the Ak-Horde and Kok-Horde has been put in the academic publication of the history of Kazakhstan. Thus, T.I .Sultanov believes that the term «Ak-Horde» refers to the region that was the main part of Shayban's possession, and later the name spread to whole Kazakhstan, including Horde descendants. On uniting two uluses of Shayban and Orda-Edzhen into one state Ak-Horde wrote K.I. Petrov, K.A. Pishchulina.

Control questions:

1. When did the process of separating of Orda-Edzhen's Ulus from the Golden Horde begin?
2. What primary source gives us the most complete data on the political history of Ak-Horde?
3. What is the essence of the debate about Ak-Horde and Kok-Horde?
4. Where did Abulgazy locate Ak-Horde?
5. Where did Muin al-Din Natanzy locate Ak-Horde and Kok-Horde?

3.4.2. Eastern Desht-i-Kipchak in the structure of the Nomadic Uzbek State (Abulkhair Khanate) 1428-1468

With Barak's removal in 1428 dominance over the eastern ulus passed from the hands Orda-Edzhen's descendants to the Shayban's descendants who united for some time around Haji Mohammad. However, even among princes of the Shaybanid's house, who so hard acted against Orda-Edzhen's heirs. There was no unity concerning the governing the ulus. As long ago as before the defeat of Barack

the nomadic elite proclaimed their Khan Prince Dzhumadyk, thereby challenging the right of Haji Mohammed Khan on Shayban's throne. Soon the third pretender, Prince Abulkhair, was also from Shayban's house rose against both Khans.

These three princes, challenging the right to the kingdom, relied on the certain circles both in Shayban's Ulus and at the Nogay's, who because of their closeness and multiplicity had a great influence of shaybanids. Hadji-Mohammed was supported by Edigei's son Mansur, Abulkhair – by the Edigei's grandson Vakkass.

In 1428 Abulkhair was declared Khan, who established on the throne of the state. «Chiefs: of the tribes Kiyats, Mangyts, Durmens, Kushchis, Naimans, Kungrats and others, generally about 200 clans and tribes in the Toura city proclaimed Abulkhair as their Khan».

But soon after coming to power Abulkhair faced a difficult task – the subordination to his authority other Shaybanids and Jujids, and also conducting foreign policy that would make profits from military campaigns. Thus, he would justify the desire of the nomadic aristocracy, who had put him on the throne.

Proclaimed khan (1428) Abulkhair in the same year made a campaign to the Toura city, took it and made it his capital. During that period the Western Siberia region in the Shaybanid's Ulus was controlled by Shaybanid Haji Mohammed Khan.

Masud Bin Kuhistani – the author of «Tarikhi Abulkhair Khani» – the main source of the Nomadic Uzbeks State reported about Abulkhair's victory over Haji Mohammed Khan. Having executed the captured Khan, Abulkhair according to a Muslim custom, took Haji Mohammad's wife. The defeat of Haji Muhammad happened in 1430.

After Haji Muhammad remained his sons Mahmud and Ahmad, who after the death of their father were proclaimed khans. Because of them Abulkhair had to go from Siberia to the south, having left Tara (Tyumen) city, which had just became the capital of the state, the second capital became Horde's Bazar city, in Khwarezm.

The author of «Tarikhi Abulkhair Khani» further told more about Abulhair's proControls against Mustafa Khan, another Shaybanid. Although he mentioned about Abulkhair's victory over

Mustafa, but it is seen from his words, that after the victory over Mustafa, Abulkhair had to leave the Horde Bazaar, which had just been turned into the capital Abulkhair.

With the submission of Sighnaq and adjacent cities (Aq-Kurgan, Uzgend, Suzaq, etc.) Uzbek's possession significantly increased. Now not only to the Aral Sea shore from the mouth of the Syr Darya, but the lands situated in the East, to the eastern slopes of the Alatau with Suzaq city belonged to them. However, the appropriation of those areas according to V.V. Barthold was the most important event of his reign. The state capital became the Sighnaq city.

By that time the Abulkhair's Uzbek Union had entered the period of crisis. After the murder of Waqqas, who was Abulkhair's senior emir, the Mangyts separated from the Uzbeks. Karakalpaks, but a significant part of the nomads began to grouping around Barak's sons Dzhanybek and Giray princes, who expected a convenient moment to separate from the Uzbeks. At that critical moment Abulkhair had enter into conflict with the Kalmyks. In summer 1451, the Kalmyks headed by Uz-Timur taishi, who had captured before it the basin of the Chu, attacked the Uzbeks. In the battle in 8-10 kilometers from Sighnaq; Abulhair's capital, Uzbeks had defeated. Abulkhair Khan, having lost two of his most prominent commanders – Bakhtiar Sultan and Ahmed Sultan returned to Sighnaq, and had to make peace with the Kalmyks. Of the world's of Abulhair's biographer did not tell on the conditions peaces for the Uzbeks peace must have been humiliating. «Abulkhair Khan, after leaving in a narrow Timur taishi (to himself) left the city Sighnaq, gathering the people and Ulus, was engaged in state affairs and subjects, and putting in order the troops».

This defeat had very important meaning on it’s their political consequences. The fact was, that Abulkhair after the defeat from the Kalmyks in 1457, began increasing the tax burden on the subjected population, as he had to pay enormous war contribution. In addition, Abulkhair began repressions on the other sultans, who in his opinion had not helped him to repulse the Kalmyks campaign. Among them were Dzhanybek and Giray – descendants of Barack (Orda-Edzhen), living in the south of the state in the middle and lower reaches of the

Syr Darya. In proControl against Abulkhair's pressure Dzhanybek and Giray migrated from the State of the Nomadic Uzbeks in the North-west Semirechye to Moghulistan.

In 1468 Abulkhair undetook his campaign to Semirechye. On the one hand, he wanted to return the fugitives. On the other hand, Abulkhair would like to join Semirechye. During his campaign in the Almaty countryside Abulkhair died. Thus his last campaign left unfinished.

Control questions:

1. How did Barak elimination from Eastern uluses happen?
2. Which dinasty did the power under the East Desht-i-Kipchak after 1428 pass to?
3. Describe Abulkhair's internal policy in the period 1428-1468.
4. Describe Abulkhair's external policy in the period 1428-1468.
5. Where were Dzhanybek and Giray's possessions located in Abylkhair Khanate?

3.4.3. Western Kazakhstan in the structure of the Nogay Horde

On the Nogay Horde – the state, formed as a result of the collapse of the Golden Horde there are a lot of sources. For example, in the funds of Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi arkhiv drevnikh aktov (RGADA) [Russian State Archive of Early Acts] preserved in their complete form so-called «Nogayskie dela», one way or another reflecting the Nogay Horde history, beginning from the second half of XVI century. The most part of the materials from the «Nogay skie dela» was published in the Appendices to the History of Russia «of Prince M.M. Shcherbatov, the rest materials up to including 1577, were published by N.I. Novikov in» Continuation of the ancient Russian vivliofiki (p.VII X1), another part of the material was published in various other editions, what greatly facilitated the study of the Nogayi Horde history.

Some aspects of the Nogay Horde history were touched on by the V.V. Belyaminov-Zernov, N.I. Veselovsky, G. Peretyakovich, V.V. Bartold, P.P. Ivanov, The History or Mongols until IX-XIII centuries by Hovar, printed in 1876 in London, V.V. Trepavlov. However, researchers studied mainly the Nogay Horde history of the

XVI-XVII centuries. But till now the history of the Nogay Horde or the Mangytsky yurt formation has not been studied.

But researches carried out on the early history of the Nogay Horde, now have obviously become out of date. For example, the English orientalist Hovar identified the laControl Nogay s with the former Pechenegs, although by the XIII century the Pechenegs as a nation had ceased their existence, having merged with the Polovtses in the XII century. N.I. Veselovsky in his work «Khan of the Golden Horde temnik Nogay and his time» saw in the laControl Nogays the Temnik Nogaja‘s subjects, also called by his name.

The same points of view were kept by the authors of the History of the Uzbek SSR. But Temnik Nogay's ulus was situated at the Danube, and his subjects had never called themselves Nogays. After Nogay and his sons's defeated in 1301, Nogay's ulus people were distributed among the princes, and scattered in other uluses.

Until the XVI century, the term «Nogays» was unknown. The term «Nogays» and «Nogay Horde» first appeared in Western European literature only in 1517 in «Skazaknia o dvuh Sarmatiyas Mattheiya Miechóvskovo, and in oriental literature – of the Turkish historian Dzhannebi, who died in 1590 and who called Edigey» the head of the Nogay's generation.

In their charters the Nogays usually called themselves Mangyts, considering the name «Nogay» insulting, because the Mongolian word «Nokay» meant «dog». The name «Nogay», «Nogays», obviously, was given to them by other nations or, probably, Tokhtamysh Khan's surrounding, who gave that nickname Edigey. Later, the name «nogay» was also fixed for his ulus people. Therefore, the compiler of the Compendium of Chronicle Kadyrgali Zhalayri calls Edigey none other than «the dog». As it was already noted, the Nogays called themselves Mangyts, and their state Mangyt Yurt. This is explained by the fact that the founder of the Mangyt's yurt Edigey, who was descended from the Mongol tribe of the Mangyts, was the chief, and later the Prince of that tribe. Edigey before the invasion of Timur to the Golden Horde, having betrayed his Khan, went over to Timur, was one of the instigators of the war in 1391. But when Timur after the defeat of the Golden Horde began resettling the inhabitants of Desht-i-Kipchak to Central Asia, Edigey

betrayed Timur and fled to the Mangyts together with with his armed forces, which were composed of his fellow – tribesmen.

Soon, according to Clavijo, he was proclaimed prince of the Mangyt tribes which had just moved on. Clavijo, correctly rendering the events connected with the reign of Edigey, made a mistake, having said about the proclamation of Edigey Tsar (Khan), whom he had never been, neither he himself nor his successors had had the title of Khan, and where only known as a princes. Not belonging to the descendants of Juji, Edigey could not claim the title of khan. Ibn Arabshah being more informed about Edigey than Clavijo, said: «He could not assume the title of Sultan (i.e. Khan), because, if it had been possible, Timur would have proclaimed himself, who had taken possession of the kingdom». Latter, despite of all his power, remained only Gurgen, so did Edigey being content with the title Mangyt's yurt Prince.

Edigey's «Mangyt yurt» which was separated from the Golden Horde in 1391, was then already one of the significant unions. According to Clavijo, «Edigey had constantly in his horde over two hundred thousand horsemen». After 1391 Edigey temporarily left the political arena and until 1395 his name was not found in the sources, it appeared again just before the second Timur's campaign against Tokhtamysh. So, for example, Clavijo said about Timur's making a request for Edigey about the union before going to the Golden Horde in 1395. But judging by Edigey's response, we can conclude that the alliance against Tokhtamysh had not been concluded and Edigey during the campaign of 1395-96 remaind aside. On the political arena Edigey appeared after a second defeat Tokhtamysh. For his assistance in Timur-Kutluk's ascending he was appointed his senior emir-beklyaribek. Edigey retained the post until his death (1420) and for more than 20 years ran the Golden Horde almost by Rights of Khan. Therefore, Arab writers called him tsar (almalek), although he had never been it, was called as usual by only bek, the Golden Horde.

Governing the state set through the Khans, who where at his hands he succeeded meanwhile in making the Mangyt's yurt to be one of the biggest state unions in the structure of the Golden Horde that was able to- deliver up to two hundred thousand soldiers from

his ulus. He had about 20 sons – wrote Ibn Arabshah – each of which was a ruling tsar, having his own apanage, army and supporters.

After the death of Edigey his successor on governing the Mangyt's yurt, became his son Gazy declared prince (bek) according to his father's will. In the days of ruling Dzhumaduh Khan's Sultanate (1426-1428) Gazy Bek mangyt – wrote Masud ben Osmani Kuhistani – according to the will of his father became the leader of his people and tribe, but emirs and chiefs of the tribes rebelled against him having killed him.

With the leaving most of the emirs and chiefs of the tribe for Siberia the Mangyt fell into decay for a time. Edigey's sons and grandsons dispersed in different directions. One of his sons, Mansour went to the Haji Muhammad Khan, another son Edigey Nowruz was at Uluk-Muhammad, Edigey's grandson Waqqas helped Abulkhair. Nomadic population, previously subordinated to Edigey and his successor Gaziy, moved on to the Uzbeks to Central Asia, it was a reason for impoverishing the yurt.

In the Mangyt yurt together with Edigey's youngest son Nuratdin, who according to the Mongolian tradition inherited the appanage – his father yurt, which was situated on the Yaik, remained only a small part of the nomads. Judging by the sources, Nuratdin took a number of steps to gather the remains of the former uluses. Somehow he managed to subdue the areas adjacent to the Volga. Nogay Murzas in their charters wrote: «but the Volga and the Yaik that areboth my father's yurts, because my father was Prince (Edigey) the great on the Yaik and the other is the father of mine Nuraddin Murza on the Volga».

About Nuratdin's activities on restorations of the Mangyt yurt is much talked in the Karanogay edition «Skazaknie ob Edigey I Tokhtamyshe» as a monument which began shortly after the death of Nuratdin. In the Stories the main role in establishing the Nogay Horde is ascribed not so much to, Edigey himself as to his son Nuratdin. It is evident from the stories that his claim on supremacy over Mangyt Yurt caused strong dissatisfaction on a part of representatives of other noble clans. They had remembered about not notable origin of Edigey and his descendants, not belonging to the descendants of Genghis Khan. There for, Nuratdin's supporters had

to «substantiate» answering to Nuratdin's rights for supremacy over the horde, quickly to make a genealogy for Edigey. Answering to discontented elements Nuratdin said: From birth I seen and recognized a single god, the god himself patronized me every where, but that fact that I'm not from of Genghis Khan' clan, not a bit oppresses me, for I am – of the glorious tribe of Hochahmata Tulikov. At the same time according to Nuratdin's direction on the made Edigey and his successors' genealogy, who as if claimed to be descendants of either the Central Asian mystic Khoja Ahmed Yasawi, who died in 1166, or descendants of the Prophet Muhammad himself.

Despite of the fact that Nuratdin managed to restore some what the Mangyt yurt, however, nevertheless he was not declared Prince of the Nogay Horde. In official genealogical table of Nogay princes and mursas he was only mentioned as a mursa, but not as a nogayprince. Matthew Miechóvsly attributes the final formation of the Nogay Horde to Nuratdin'son – Okkasu (Waqqas). Waqqas, as it was mentioned above when considering the history of the formation of the Uzbek Union, was one of the major parties, cutting with a sword for Abulkhair and began his senior emir. But he, having a presentiment of the weakening of the Uzbeks, in 1447 separated from Abuklhair and returned to the Mangyt yurt, where he was declared Nogay prince. In the genealogy of the nogays princes and mursas, he was named Nogay Prince. It is true; he was soon assassinated by Abulkhair's agents. After the murder of Waqqas his brother Abbas was proclaimed Nogay prince.

The Nogay Horde, which finally took shape as an independent state in the forties of the XVI century especially, began strengthening due to the weakening and defeat of the Uzbek Union. Then many representatives of the tribe, early being a part of the Uzbek Union, joined the Nogays. While the collapse of the Abulkhair's horde Abbas, together with the sons of Haji Mohammed played an active role in the capture of the eastern possessions of Abulkhair in the mouths of Syr-Darya, the Amu Darya and the upper reaches of the Irtysh.

In the XVI century Possessions of the Mangyts princes bordered in the North-west with the Kazan Khanate by the rivers Samarka,

Kinel and Kinelchek there were their summer pastures. The Bashkirs and Ostyaks living near river Ufa, paid tribute to the Nogays. In the north-east the Nogay Horde bordered with the Siberian Khanate. According to G.F. Miller, the region, situated in the south-east of Tyumen, was called Nogay steppe. The well-known Kazakh scholar of the first half of the XIX century Chocan Valikhanov considered the Altai Mountains as a boundary line separating the Kazakh Khanate from the NogayHorde. In the first half of the XVI century the Nogays wandered in the lower reaches of the Syr Darya River, the shores of the Aral Sea, the Kara-Kum, Barsunkum and north-eastern coast of the Caspian Sea.

Being one of the largest state entities, which arose on the ruins of the Golden Horde the Nogay Horde differed from other newly formed Tatar states with its internal weakness, fragmentation. Saraychuk City, the only town on the territory of the horde, for a hundred years of Nogay Horde existence, had not been restored and remained in a dilapidated condition.

With the formation of the Nogay Horde, the Siberian Khanate and independent khanate of the Kazakhs and Uzbeks, the Golden Horde had ceased it's existence as a state union. Under the authority of Uluk Muhammad Khan remind only a small part of lands and uluses, located to the west from the Volga. However, even there that time also was going on a process of formation of new associations.

Control questions:

1. Etymology of the term «Nogay».
2. When did Mangyt yurt of the Golden Horde finally form into the state entity?
3. What are the characteristics of the Nogay Horde in comparison with other states that emerged after the collapse of the Golden Horde?
4. List the researchers of the Golden Horde.
5. Which sources do provide information about the Nogay Horde?

3.4.4. South-East Kazakhstan in the structure of the Moghulistan

After the Mongol invasion the territory of Southeast part of Kazakhstan appeared in the structure of the Chagataid ulus (from 1269 the Chagataid's State). Formation of Moghulistan –

an independent state, which united Turkic and Turkicised Mongolian tribes of Southeast Kazakhstan, was connected with the disintegration of the Chagataid state into western and eastern parts in the middle of the XIV century.

In 1348 in the eastern part the Turkic nobility in the name of the Dughlat tribe leaders put the Chagataid Tughlugh Timur as a khan.

Internal and foreign policy of the first khans of Moghulistan.

History of the internal political life of the new state which arose on the territory of South-east Kazakhstan, in the middle of the XIV century has not enough been reflected in sources. It is known that the headquarters of the first khan was situated in Almalyk. More detailed data in the sources only given on foreign policy aspects.

Tughlugh Timur's main goal was spreading his power on Maveranahre. For this purpose in 1360 and 1361 he made campaigns to the territory of Maveranahre. Then his successor Ilyas Khoja Khan (who occupied the throne after Tughlugh Timur's death in 1362-1363) continued this policy.

So, for example in 1365 Ilyas Khoja Khan undertook a campaign to Central Asia territories. Timur and emir Husajn's armies met the Moghuls near Tashkent on the bank of the Syr-Darya. The battle which took place there has the name – «Mud battle», as during the battle began heavy shower, which made difficulties for military actions, as horses were slipping and fell down. The Moghuls were more habitual to the severe climate, were able to stand up.

The victory had opened for the Moghuls the way to Maveranahre. Muiinad-din Natanzy reported about robberies of the Moghuls on their way to Samarkand. However Ilyas Khoja Khan failed to take the city, the population headed by Serberdars showed resistance to the aggressor. Thus attempts of the first two khans of Moghulistan to restore the Chagataid State were not crowned with success.

The first governors of the State in Southeast part of Kazakhstan were not able to strengthen their state in the face of danger of emir Timur's campaigns. Short governing of Ilyas Khoja Khan in Maveranahre was marked by weakness of central power in

Moghulistan. After Ilyas Khoja Khan's defeat in Maveranahre, the leader of the Dughlat tribe Qamar ud-Din made an attempt to seize power in Moghulistan. In 1365/1366 Qamar ud-Din attacked Ilyas Khoja's headquarters and killed him. Emir Qamar ud-Din tried to subordinate Moghulistan to his power for a long time. But in fact in Moghulistan there was no centralized power.

Struggle of the population of Southeast Kazakhstan against aggressive policy of emir Timur

Political history of the state in South-east Kazakhstan at the last third of the XV century was connected with the repulse of emir Timur's campaigns and later nomadic eastern neighbors – the Kalmyks (oirats). During that period emir Timur made a series of campaigns to the territory of Moghulistan: in 1371, in 1375, in 1377 (twice). In spite of the fact that in the battle of 1383 the Moghuls gained victory, a chain of defeats of Qamar ud-Din from Timur undermined his influence as the head of the uluses, who had united a number of tribes in South-east Kazakhstan.

In 1389 г. Timur undertook the most destructive campaign to South-east Kazakhstan. At that time according to the data of the Timurid and other compositions in Moghulistan there were several actually independent from each other possessions: Qamar ud-Din's ulus, uluses of Bulgachi, Baarins, Arkenuds, Enge-Tores. By 1389, having taken advantage of that Qamar ud-Din had lost the real power, leaders of the Dughlat tribe in the name of emir Khudaidad put Tughlugh Timur's son Khizr Khoja the khan of Moghulistan. Thus after becoming the khan Khizr Khoja till the 90th of the XV century was the nominal governor. But only in the 90th of the XV century his power became to be real.

Timur's campaigns to Moghulistan in 1389 ended by destructions and devastations of Moghulistan. The next year Timur again sent his army in order to finally devastate the region and to exterminate its population. On returning from the campaign of 1389 Timur left his son Dzhanshah the governor in Moghulistan, obviously, having compelled Khizr Khoja to become his vassal. As a result emir Timur's campaigns khan power in Moghulistan weakened even more, disunity and strives aggravated.

South-East Kazakhstan in the period of disunity in the first half of the XV century

In the 90th of the XV century Khizr Khoja could gradually widen his power over many Moghul tribes and uluses. Emir Timur helped him with it. Khizr Khoja strengthened their relations with Timurids by dynasty marriage: gave his sister to emir Timur. But it is necessary to underline that dependence of Moghulistan on Timur's state was rather nominal, than real.

Relative safety of the werstern borders allowed the Moghul khan to pursue an active policy in the east of the country. According to Sharaf ad-din Iyasdy and Mirza Muhammad Haidar Dughlati Khizr Khoja seized two cities – Turfan and Kara-Khoja and also joined the eastern part of the disintegrating Uigur State to Moghulistan.

But to fix his possessions on the eastern frontiers the Moghul khan could not because of Timur's campaign to China in 1404. Nevertheless Khizr Khoja was able to unite Moghulistan for some time and to stop strives.

After Khizr Khoja's death in Moghulistan began struggle for power between his four sons. In that struggle gradually gained the victory Sham-i-Dzhahan (1399-1408). He tried to combat with Timurids in order to release the western parts of Moghulistan, which was seized during the campaign to China. Gradually having strengthened his political and military situation Sham-i-Dzhahan began actively to interfere into internal affairs of the Timurids, captured by inControline struggle after emir Timur's death.

After Sham-i- Dzhahan's death in Moghulistan another son of Khizr Khoja the Moghul's khan became Muhammad-oglan (1408-1416). At first he had submit to Shah Rukh – the governor of Timurid's state. Thus under Muhammad-khan Moghulistan both actually and nominally became independent from the Timurids. He not only released the western areas of Moghulistan - Chu-Talas valley from the power of the Timurids, but also tried to find a way out to agricultural oases. His successful foreign policy also somewhat strengthened the internal political situation.

With Muhammad's khan's death in 1415-1416 in Moghulistan began a new wave of strives. Khizr Khoja's grandson Hakhsh-Dzhahan seized the power for two years. Tarikh-i-Rashidi told

nothing about the time of governing this khan. Mirza Muhammad Haidar Dughlati reported only on his connections with the settled-agricultural nobility of Kashgar and also about his participation in choosing Hakhsh-Dzhahan as a khan of Emir Hudaidat Dughlat.

Hakhsh-Dzhahan was not able to stop strife in Moghulistan. In 1418 he was killed by Shir-Ali-oglan's son and Khizr Khoja's grandson Weiss-oglan. Though Weiss-oglan succeeded to seize power in Moghulistan, but he could not keep the throne for a long time. He ruled till 1421. Timur's grandson Ulughbek in 1414 used the sedition in Moghulistan; he joined Kashgar to the Timurid's possessions and also tried to spread the Timurid's influence to Semirechye and the Tyan-Shyan.

In 1421 with the support of Ulughbek the power in Moghulistan was seized by Shir-Muhammad. The Moghul nobility divided: some supported Weiss-oglan, others – Ulughbek's chosen. But after becoming khan Shir-Muhammad ceased to obey Ulughbek. It was an occasion to Ulughbek's campaigns to Moghulistan in 1425. Though that campaign brought to the population of Southeast Kazakhstan great disasters, but did not break Moghulistan's integrity as a state. In this respect, according to V.V. Barthold it was ineffectual. Ulughbek was not able to seize those territories and seat his protégé on the throne in Moghulistan.

After Ulughbek's campaign in 1423 the struggle for power between Weiss-oglan and Shir-Muhammad continued till Shir-Muhammad's death. The time of Weiss – khan's governing was characterized by strengthening the struggle with the Oirats on the eastern frontiers. In all according to Mirza Muhammad Haidar Dughlati Weiss-oglan had withstood 61 battles with the Oirats and did manage to move deep into territories of Moghulistan in the 20th of theXV century. However Weiss-oglan had transfered his headquarters from East Turkestan to Semirechye into the valley of the river Ili.

While Weiss-khan was occupied with the repulse of the Oirat's attacks in 1428 Ulughbek sent his army to Moghulistan again. In the country of Issyk Kul lake Weiss-khan was killed in the battle, which happened there intensifying the disintegration in Moghulistan in the second quarter of the XV century. Temporary stabilization of Moghulistan finished with the death of Weiss-khan. Besides the

country was significantly weakened by long struggle with the Oirats and Timurids. Khan power in the 30th of the XV century came almost to northing. Weiss-khan's failures in his struggle against external enemies, inability to conduct independent active policy undermined the fragile unity of the country which had established under Khizr Khoja and his successors.

Mirza Muhammad Haidar Dughlati wrote: After Weiss-khan the Moghul ulus fell into full frustration and decay. Its nobility divided into two groupings again supporting very young Weiss – khan's sons: Esen-Buga and Zhunis-sultan. In this struggle the victory was gained by the leaders of Dughlat who in 1433 put Esen-Buga their khan. But the leaders suffering a defeat of Baarin and Churas tribes with 30 thousand Moghul families moved to Maverannahr, hoping with Ulughbek's help to return to the struggle for power.

Only by the end of the 40th of the XV century Esen-Buga had subordinated tribes of Semirechye and Tyan-Shyan to his power, using the strife in Maverannahr during the years of Ulughbek's governing.

In 1449 Esen-Buga made devastating raids to Sairam, Turkestan, and Tashkent. The Timurid Abu Said-mirza to provide safety of his northeast possessions, decided to seat on the throne in Moghulistan, who had stayed Zhunis-sultan in Timurid's possessions for 18 years. But without having a strong support among the Moghul tribes, Zhunis-sultan suffered a defeat from Esen-Buga. The Timurid Abu-Said-mursa did not leave his guardianship over him, in 1457 having given him the territory on the eastern frontier of Fergana as a appanage.

In 1462 Zhunis-sultan interfered again in the struggle for power after death of Esen-Buga and became firmly established in the western areas of Moghulistan adjoining to Fergana. In the 50th of the XV century Southeast Kazakhstan underwent the attack of the Oirats, who in 1452 came to the territory of Moghulistan again, having reached the banks of the Chu River.

Political history of Moghulistan in the second half of the XV century.

Political situation of Moghulistan by the middle of the XV century was unstable. Tendencies of disintegration of Moghulistan and

liquidation of the power of the khans-Chagataids, which began even long before the formation of the Kazakh Khanate, especially intensified in the second half of the XV century.

The nobility struggle led to formation on the territory of Moghulistan several possessions: Ahmad-khan's, Mahmud-khan's, Halil-sultan's, and Mansur-khan's.

Pressure of the Oirats also weakened Moghulistan. The situation in the west changed too, struggle in the State of the Timurids gave an opportunity to the Moghul khan to seize territories in the west, but weakened the situation in Semirechye – the Kazakh tribes of Semirechye began leaving from under their power.

The main content of the history of Moghulistan of the second half of the XV century was the disintegration process of the state. After Esen-Buga-khan died in 1462 Zhunis-khan managed only to conquer the south-east part of Moghulistan. In the northern and north-east part he failed to become stronger, as was intensifying the Kazakh governors.

A direct heir of Esen-Buga, his son Dost-Muhammad ruled in Kashgaria till 1468. After his death the throne was taken by Zhunis-khan, who had managed to unite in his hands southern areas of Moghulistan and Manglay-Sube by 1472.

In the 70th of the XV century in Kashgaria Zhunis-khan interfered to dissension of the Dughlat emirs. Zhunis-sultan also tried to occupy with the struggle for the Prisyrdarya. But there in 1472 Zhunis – sultan suffered a defeat from the Kalmyks, he escaped to the Syr-Darya. Thus Zhunis-khan transferred his interests to the territories to the west from Moghulistan – to Sairam, Tashkent, which he seized in 1482-1485.

During that period the Moghul nobility spelt up a part of them stopped obeying Zhunis-khan and together with his son Ahmad in 1484 went to the eastern areas of the state, occupied by the Kirgiz.

In Kirgizia in 1480-1514 Mirza Aba Bakr's independent possession stood apart. In the northern part of Moghulistan the Kazakh khan’s power became stronger; the increasing number of clans and tribes with their ethnic territories entered the structure of their possessions. The northern part of Moghulistan in the 70-80th of

the XV century was the arena of resistance of the Kazakh and Kirgiz tribes to the aggressive policy of the Oirats.

Ahmad-khan, who left for the eastern areas needed about 10 years when he subordinated the local population to the Khans-Chagataids. In 1487 in Tashkent and south-western areas of Moghulistan Zhunis-khan's son Sultan-Mmahmud who actively interfered to the struggle of the Kazakh governors against Shaybanids for the Prisyrdarya at the end of the 80th-the beginning of the 90th of the XVth century, as a gratitude for support of Muhammad Shaybani in the battle with the Timurid sultan Ahmad-mursa on the Chirchik river, in 1488 he gave him Otrar, which had been taken from the Kazakhs. It meant of friendly relations with the Kazakh governors. But in two battles with the Kazakh Sultan Mahmud had suffered from a defeat.

Thus the domestic situation in Moghulistan which established in the second half of the XV century, and also the whole complex of military-political events in the region created a ground for gradual weakening the power of the Moghul khans in South-east Kazakhstan and leaving tribes and clans from under their power which later adjoined the Kazakh Khanate. On the boundary of the XV-XVI centuries Moghulistan ceased its existence as a state.

Control questions:

1. To Read a fragment from Muin-ad-din Natanzy «Ananimous of Iskandar» the permanent address: http://www.vostlit.info/Texts/rus3 /Iskandar/ frametext.htm.
2. In writing form to give the main point of view of the author, what he meant under the Ak-Horde and the Kok-Horde?
3. To write reaction paper (300 words) for the monography of Ahmedov «The State of Nomadic Uzbeks».
4. To write an essay on the theme: V.V. Trepavlov's contribution in the Nogay Horde history studying.
5. To read the following work: Пищулина К.А. Юго-восточный Казахстан в середине XIV – начале XVI вв.: Вопросы политической и социально-экономической истории). – Алма-Ата, 1977. In writing form to give an answer to the question: What are the main primary sources for this book?
6. How did you understand the essence of the debate about Ak-Horde and Kok-Horde?
7. Which territory does State of Nomadic Uzbeks occupy?

8. Which peculiarities of the Nogay Horde can you signed? Compare Nogay Horde with other Post-Mongolian State entities?
9. How did call Muslim author of the XV century the population of the East Desht-i-Kipchak?
10. What were the political consequences of Abulkhair's defeat from the Kalmyks in 1457?
11. Make a chronological table khan-chagataids 's governing in Moghulistan.

Seminar tasks:

1. Political history of Ak-Horde in the XIV-XV centuries.
2. Written sources about Abulkhair's internal and external policy (1428-1468).
3. Political history of Moghulistan in the middle of the XIV-XV centuries.
4. Discussion about Ak-Horde and Kok-Horde.

IV Part

KAZAKH KHANATE AND FORMATION OF KAZAKH NATION EPOCH, THE MIDDLE OF THE XV – THE FIRST THIRD OF THE XVIII CENTURIES

4.1. Written sources on the Kazakh Khanate (the second half of the XV– the first third of XVIII centuries)

As the prominent Russian Orientalist, T.I. Sultanov pointed out, the specifics of the research of the medieval history of Kazakhstan largely determined by weak spreading a writing language and book education among the Kazakhs. It should be noted the only work created in the early of the XVII century by a representative of the Zhalair tribe Kadyrgali-bek.

Data on the history of the Kazakh Khanate largely known in science from the writings of the medieval authors. The most important material is contained in narrative sources: historical, memoir, geographical, written mainly in Persian (Farsi), Chagatai, old Uzbek, and also Arabic languages. Their self-descriptiveness is different, the most degree of knowledgeable were authors from neighboring Central Asia and also Iran, Eastern Turkestan. Unfortunately, there are no sources on the history of the Kazakh Khanate. Available data to historians on the Kazakh Khanate history are represented in the works fragmentarily. They are mostly related to political history, the history of relations with the neighboring states, and also there are genealogic of khans of various dynasties in them. There are data on their ethnic composition, economy, and elements of spiritual and material culture in some sources.

Nowadays, a significant number of sources have been introduced into science, as well as translated into Russian.

Two types of classification are mainly spread among the researchers: linguistic and dynastic. It is considered, that the dynastic classification of the written sources is the most exact, and they are divided into Timurid, Moghul, Shaybanid, Astarkhanid groups.

Among them Timurid works are of great importance to the study of the period, which had proceeded to the formation of the Kazakh Khanate.

The Shaybanid complexes of sources on their self-descriptiveness play the leading role. They were written in the XVI century, during the reign of the Shaybanid dynasty in Central Asia, therefore, primarily cover Muhammad Shaybanid activities and his grandfather Abulkhair, as well as their successor, Abdullah Khan in the second half of XVI century .The Shaybanid traditions of historiography were founded by Muhammad Shaybani, who, after conquering Maverannahr, charged Timurid school men – writers, historians, who had gone over him, to give a memorable description not only his heroic deeds, but deeds of his ancestors – the Shaybanids – in the pages of historical works.

This group includes sources, both written in Persian and Turkic, such as for example of Muhammad Salih's, «Shaybani-name».

Shaybanid sources (Nusrat-name, Fathk-name, «Shaybani – name» of Kamal ad-Din Binai, Shaybani -name of an anonymous author, Shaybani-name of Muhammad Salih, Fazlullah Ibn Ruzbihan Isfahani «Mihmann nama-I Bukhara») have a richest factual material for the study of primarily the political history of the Kazakh Khanate.

Of this circle sources that are valuable for us, not only with materials of political history, but also as having important data of, historical and ethnographic character, it should be particularly noted «Mihmann nama-I Bukhara» by the Persian Fazlullah Ibn Ruzbihan Isfahani. The Essay was devoted to the Muhammad Shaybani Khan's campaign in winter 1508-1509 against the Kazakhs. This source is particularly valuable as he accompanied the Khan in his campaign. Therefore we can say that all the original data about the Kazakhs were based on personal observations and questioning eye-witnesses. Thus, the source has unique data about Uzbeks' campaign against the

Kazakhs, and also information about the way of life, economy, ethnic make-up the Eastern Desht-i-Kipchak, as well as rich historical and geographical material.

In the official history Muhammad Salih's, «Shaybani-name» written in the Turkic language, there are data of the Shaybani Khan's relations with the first Kazakh rulers – Giray and Dzhanybek Khan, as well as the Burunduk and Qasim Khan. The Source contains unique data about the fight for the Syr Darya cities of in 1470-1500.

The anonymous essay «Tavarikh-i guzida-yi Nusrat name» («Selected history of the victories book») tells on the situation in the Desht-i-Kipchak after the Abulkhair Khan's death, Dzhanybek Khan and Giray's deeds. There are details of the Shaybani Khan's struggle against Kazakh and Moghul khans for possession on the Syr Darya cities and valuable data about the Dzhanybek Khan's campaign to Central Asia.

Numerous data about Kazakhstan Kazakhs and are contained in the work of literary man, «one of the most skilled master of the Tajik verse» Kamal ad-Din Binai (1453-1512) «Shaybani-name». «Shaybani-name» of Kamal ad-Din Binai described the situation in East Desht-i-Kipchak after Abulkhair Khan, the loss of power by his son Sheikh Haidar Khan, the Jujids opposition including Dzhanybek and Giray, the Kazakh khans and Mangyt mursas, their struggle for influence in the Syr Darya cities region. Of great value data on these cities – Otrar, Sighnaq, Sauran, as well as data on Desht-i-Kipchak tribes, which were a part of the Kazakh, Uzbek, Bashkir and other Turkic speaking peoples.

An important place among the Shaybanid historical literature occupies the world history of Masud Bin Othman Kohistani «Tarikh-I Abulkhair Hani», namely her original part, devoted to the history of nomadic Uzbeks head – Abulkhayr Khan, who ruled in East Desht-i-Kipchak in 1428-1468.

Zaynu-ad-din Wasifi's «Badai al-Vacai» («Amazing Events») memoirs are greatly appreciated by the history of late medieval scholars. In this essay there are also data on the history of Kazakhstan – on Shaybanid Ubaydullah Khan's campaign against the Kazakhs and the report of the victory over the Kazakhs (1537). Particular importance is given to the source because of the fact, that

territory, which the Kazakhs occupied, was called «Kazakhstan» for the first time.

Material on the history of the Kazakhs contains in the part on Shaybanids "Zubdat al-Asar by Abdullah Balkhi. Abdullah Balkhi told on Muhammad Shaybani Khan's campaign against the Kazakhs at the end of the life of this ruler. This campaign took place in 1510 and ended with the defeat of the Uzbeks. However the date of the campaign should be defined more exactly: it is possible the campaign was undertaken not in 1510 but in 1509. In accordance with all the Shaybanid historiography Abdullah Balkhi considered that for the defeat of the Uzbeks Muhammad Shaybani Khan was not responsible and other persons were guilty.

In the Shaybanid historiography after Muhammad Shaybani for studding history of the Kazakh Khanate of the second half of XVI century has great value Hafiz-Tanysh's «Sharaf Namayi Shahiy», known as «Abdulla-name». The source shows unfavorable foreign policy situation for the Kazakhs in the second half of XVI century. As a result of which the Kazakh khan Shigai joined vassal service of the Uzbek Khan Abdullah, but later, in the time of Tavakkul the Kazakhs broke vassal relations and opposed Uzbeks.

Thus, among the sources of the late medieval period, informative significance of the Shaybanid historiography for studying the Kazakh Khanate is extremely high.

Period of the XVII century found its reflection in a seven volumed encyclopedic work by Mahmud B. Emir Wali Bahr Al-Asrar, relating according to the dynastic classification to the Astarkhanid historiography. Volume VI materials are related to the history of Kazakhstan, especially on the history of relations with Central Asia in the first decades of the XVI century. Of interest are materials on the confrontation between Kazakh sultans Ishim Khan and Tursun, Ishim Khan's campaign against the Oirats, granting Tashkent and Turkestan to Ishim Khan by Imam Quli Khan and other data.

Control questions:

1. What groups are the sources of the Kazakh Khanate divided into according to the dynasty classification?

2. Where are the data on struggle for the Syr Darya region in the last third of the XV century?
3. What source tells on Muhammad Shaybani's campaigns against the Kazakhs the early XVI century?
4. What source was the term «Kazakhstan» used in at first?
5. Who introduced the Shaybanid sourses in the Kazakh historiography?

4.2. Formation and strengthening of the Kazakh khanate 1470-1500

At the end of the 60-the beginning of 70th of the XVth century a number of the population subjected to Dzhanybek and Giray increase at the expense of the inflow of the nomads from Central and Southern Kazakhstan who run after Abulkhair death from the Uzbek Ulus. The matter is that the Nomadic Uzbeks State after Abulkhair's death seized with seditions and inControline wars.

Dzhanybek and Giray possessing considerable military forces and having strong back in Semirechye began their struggle for the population of East Desht-i-Kipchak. Abulkhair-khan's descendants were their main enemies. About first Kazakh khans actions we take data, basically from the Shaybanid circle of sources.

First Kazakh possessors and sultans – the Shaybanids struggled for power over the population of East Desht-i-Kipchak steppe areas, but the events were developed mainly in the Turkestan city centers (Prisyrdarya). The reason was economic and strategic value of this area:

1. Prisyrdarya which in medieval sources was called as Turkestan, was the traditional economic and political center of previous state formations on the territory of medieval Kazakhstan-Ak-Horde and Abulkhair's State

2. The lands of lower and middle reaches of Syr-Darya were necessary for nomad tribes subjected to Kazakh khans as a valuable winter pastures;

3. Prisyrdarya cities were necessary to the Kazakh khans as defence-strategic points. They were good fortresses, capable to stand a long siege. Thus, both the Kazakh khans and Muhammad Shaybani saw in Prisyrdarya cities economic and military base for successful

struggle for power over nomads of the East Desht-i-Kipchak steppe areas.

Participants of the struggle for Prisyrdarya during that period were:

The Timurids of Maverannahr, who defended cities conquered by them during the struggle against the Ak-Horde khans and transformed into defensive fortresses against the nomads of steppe areas.

Moghul khans, sultan Junus and his son sultan Mahmud interfered with this struggle, trying in the conditions of decline of Moghulistan to have under their power the territories on the northeast suburb of the Timurid state, which was disintegrating i.e. in the area around Fergana, Tashkent and the south of Turkestan.

Relations of the Kazakh khans and Shaybanid sultans in the last third of the XV century

Process of their struggle for power in East Desht-i-Kipchak and Turkestan are subdivided into some stages.

By the winter of 1470 the Kazakh possessors had considerably moved to Turkestan. Dzhanybek Khan's elder son Mahmud sultan occupied in the foothills of Karatau – Suzaq. Other his son became owner of Sauran, and Giray-khan himself approached to Turkestan. Activization of the Kazakhs' actions in the south of Kazakhstan made Muhammad Shaybani leave immeadiately for Maverannahr under Timurid's protection. But during his flight Muhammad Shaybani run into the army of the new owner of the city sultan - Irenchi. In that battle several sultans from Muhammad Shaybani's environment were killed, and some left him. Muhammad Shaybani had to escape to Bukhara. As a result of the first attack to Turkestan the Kazakh owners were able to hold Sauran and Suzaq and did not give an opportunity to Muhammad Shaybani to gather the Shaybanid armies, which had scattered after Shajhadar's death.

But attempts to restore the Shaybanid's power continued. In two years, Muhammad Shaybani, having received military help from the Timurids had appeared in Turkestan and seized a number of fortresses. Arquq fortress on the left bank of Syr-Darya was the first to be seized. Muhammad Shaybani, relying on it went to the north to

borders of Turkestan and East Desht-i-Kipchak and seized Sighnaq. The leader of the Nogay Horde Musa Mursa wanted to become Shaybanids's ally.

But Burunduk who arrived with his army from western Semirechye to the borders of Turkestan prevented from the planned union. In the sources telling on these events, Burunduk was named as a khan. The battle details were described in the Shaybani-name of Binai.

The Shaybanids had strengthened their positions in the cities Otrar, Yasi, Arquq, Uzgend, having forced out the Timurids from there. The Moghul khan Sultan Mahmud stayed in Tashkent and Sauran. Northern part of territory with Sighnaq and Sauran cities, and also adjoining slopes of the Karatau ridge with Suzaq belonged to the Kazakh khans.

Hence, by the end of XV century the important stage in relations of the Kazakh possessors with the Saybanids and Moghul governors had finished. In long struggle against the Saybanids the Kazakhs prevented from the restoration of their power within the limits of the former Nomadic Uzbeks State. Muhammad Shajbani left East Desht-i-Kipchak, having directed his aggressive aspirations to the Timurids state.

In due course the Kazakhs could force out other Jujids from East Desht-i-Kipchak. By the end of the XVth century the Kazakh khans state borders had become considerably stronger, were extended. Lower reaches of Syr-Darya have entered into it and Northern Priarale, besides Western Semirechye above mentioned cities and oasises in Southern Kazakhstan, the Karatau area, lower reaches of Syr-Darya and Nothern Aral region, a considerable part of the Central Kazakhstan were in its structure.

Control questions:

1. Why the struggle for power over the nomadic population of East Desht-i-Kipchak was developed not in steppe areas, but in Prisyrdarya?
2. Participants of struggle for Prisyrdarya region in the end of the XV century.
3. Results of strengthening of the Kazakh khanate in the end of XV century.
4. How the power in the Kazakh khanate did passed to the Burunduk?
5. On what conditions Kazakhs have concluded the peace agreement with the Uzbeks in the end of XV century?

4.3. Historiography of the problem «Formation of the Kazakh Nation»

The problem on the origin of the Kazakh people has been interesting scientists already throughout two and a half centuries. But among scientists there have been some points of view on this point on the given question. Before the beginning of the XX century Russian and European scientists quite often mixed up the Kazakhs with the Kirghiz. For example, in encyclopedia «The Asian Russia» it was considered that Karakirgiz – were one of the Kirghiz-Kaisak tribes. In the census of 1897 the Kazakhs and the Kirghiz were mentioned as one and the same people. Before the middle of the XVIII century in Russia the Kazakhs were named «The Kirghiz-Kajsaki», but the Kirghiz – «Buruts», «The Kara kirgiz» and «dikokamennie Kirghizi».

What questions are debated?

What has the Kazakh people to do with the ancient population of modern Kazakhstan? There are two points of view on this question:

1. P. Rychkov, S.B. Bronevsky, N.A. Maev consider that ancestors of the Kazakhs were recent migrants and had late enough come to the territory of Kazakhstan. The Kazakh people have no relation to ancient inhabitance of Kazakhstan and do not have its origin from indo-Iranian and Saka-Skythyuan tribes. This point of view is supported by the majority of researchers for more than 200 years. This point of view is called «The migratory concept of the Kazakh people origin».

2. J.P. Gaverdovsky at the beginning of the XIX century suggested an idea that the Scythians were primogenitors of the Kirghiz. According to this point of view ancestors of the Kazakhs were ancient Kazakhstan inhabitans - Indo-Iranian and Skifo-Saka tribes. This hypothesis was formulated by S.P.Tolstov. It is popular among Kazakhstan scientists who are assured that the Kazakhs are ancestors of the Andronov tribes of the Bronze epoch, and the Sakae, Usuns and Hunus. Their point of view is based on the territory, all people and tribes living on one and the same territory are ethno-historically connected with each other.

The other disputable question: the Addition time of the Kazakh people formation.

1. A.I. Levshin considered that the Kazakh people had developed in the pre-mongolian period (A. Vamberi, H. Adilgereev, M.B. Ahinzhanov).

2. V.V. Velyaminov-Zernov – Dzhanybek and Giray Khans moved on in second half of the XV century – was the closing stage of the Kazakh people formation. In the Soviet period was spread the idea – «The people Cossack developed during the epoch of disintegration of the Abulkhair ulus, but not earlier».

3. Ch. Valihanov considered, the Uzbeks and the Nogays had become the basis of the Kazakh people. The Uzbeks-Kazakhs as a people formed much earlier than Dzhanybek and Giray's move on, which could not and did not significantly influence on the origin of the Kazakh people. In the middle of the XX century this hypothesis was supported by V.P.Yudin, etc.

4. N. Krasovsky called possibility of the direct connection between of Dzhanybek and Giray's Uzbeks and Shygai khan's Kazakhs. He gave for the time of the Kazakh people origin the end of the XVI century, when the ethnonim «Kazakh» definitively became the self-name of the Kazakh people. Only then the Kazakhs became independent ethnic entity.

The following question: what is the main integrating factor in ethnogenesis: political or ethnic factors?

1. The prevailing role was played by political factors. Ch. Valihanov dated the formation of the people up the time of the Kazakh khanate formation. The Kazakh people not other then, politically integral, but anthropologically a different tribe consisting of different elements.

2. Both ethnic and political factors are significant. T.I. Sultanov considers that Dzhanybek and Giray's move on only hastened the process of forming of the Kazakh people, i.e. he recognizes the importance of both ethnic and political factors. This point of view was supported by the chapter on ethnogenesis – K. Pishchulina and B. Kumekov in the second volume of History of Kazakhstan. The state union of the basic ethnic groups of the Kazakh national and

its ethnic territory hastened the process of consolidation of the nation.

3. Ethnic factors are only priority. Some authors consider the Kazakhs to be a product of multilayered ethnic synthesis. They consider that in the course of national formation (O.Ismagulov) lies priority of proper ethnic factors. The Kazakhs- is a unique ethnos which has developed historically naturally in the scales of the modern territory of Kazakhstan. There is the direct connection between ancient tribes of the bronze epoch with Turkic tribes and the Kazakh ethnos.

4. The type of economy – nomadic or agricultural is the significant factor in national formation. The leading part of the economy type and a way of life in the process of national formation.

Stages of the Kazakhs' ethno-genesis

In pre-Mongolian period on the territory of modern Kazakhstan - in East Desht-i-Kipchak, Turkestan (Southern Kazakhstan), Semirechye had been taking place the process of ethnic integration of tribes, process of formation of the nation on the base of Turkic speaking population since the VI century, which consisted of more ancient Iranian speaking Europeans and Mongoloids of the Hun time. In the pre-Mongolian period on the most steppes part of Kazakhstan nomad tribes consolidated on the Kipchak basis, in Semirechye – on the Ujsun-Qarluqs basis.

The Mongolian invasion changed the ethnic process of development:

1. The geography of the population location changed. Many Turkic tribes moved to other areas. For example, parts of the Kipchaks moved to the limits of Northern Kazakhstan and Western Siberia.

2. Many Turkic tribes disintegrated into parts.

3. New ethnic groups, both Mongoloids and Turkic came to the territory of Kazakhstan.

4. The anthropological type of the population became more Mongoloid.

5. The Mongolian invasion became the important political factor, which significantly changed the process of the ethnic development. The former evolutionary way of formation of large nation on the territory of Kazakhstan was interrupted. Replacement of kin connections with territorial hastened the process of uniting tribes and peoples, as early living, and also those, who had come.

The final stage of the Kazakh national formation.

Process of the national and its ethnic territory formation hastened after the formation of the Kazakh state in the second half of the XV centuries. In the epoch of the Kazakh khanate union the basic peculiarities and features of material and spiritual culture of the Kazakh ethnos fixed. In productions of oral national creative work there is an obvious comprehension of the ethnic unity. As long ago as in the XVI century in written sources appeared the term «Kazakhstan» for designation of the territory of the Kazakhs. And the nation itself from second half of the XV century is known among the neighbors and in written sources under the name Kazakhs.

The term origin is a debatable question. Now it is considered, that in the Turkic-Mongolian sources the term was used in the social sense and meant a man, who had separated from his tribe, clan, and a free, unrestricted man. The term got its ethnic sounding at the beginning of the XVI century when there happened division of the ethnonims Uzbek and Kazakh. The basic content of the ethnic history in post Mongolian period included not only the national formation, but also separating the structure of the Kazakh zhus tribes. By the end of the XV-the beginning of the XVI century the zhus had come already formed both in their clan-tribal structure, and the occupied territory.

Control questions:

1. What is the essence of «migratory conception of the Kazakh nation formation»?
2. Strong and weak aspects of the concept of the autochthonic origin of the Kazakh people?
3. What scholars did consider that the Kazakh Nation formation had been taking place before Dzhanybek and Giray moved on?

4. Which of the scholars considered that ethnic factors prevail in the ethnogenesis process?
5. Which scholars considered that political factors prevail in the ethnogenesis process?

4.4. The Kazakh khanate in the first half of the XVI century

After, when at the beginning of the XVI century Muhammad Shaybani conquered the Timurid state and took away Abulkhair-khan's descendants to Central Asia, in the relations of the Kazakh possessors and Muhammad Shaybani there came a new period. To dynastic motives of the struggle joined political-economic, this attached irreconcilable character to that struggle. Fazlullah Ibn Ruzbihan Isfahani wrote about the motives of Muhammad Shaybani's policy concerning the Kazakhs at the beginning of XVI century: «However, economic blockade policy for trade – did not bring the desirable success. Moreover, when the Shaybani-khan decree became known to the Kazakhs, they began making attacks to the new possession of the Shaybanids».

It caused a replay reaction on the part of Muhammad Shaybani-khan. With that end at the beginning of the XVI century he had made four campaigns against the Kazakhs. Descriptions of these campaigns we have found in the works of Shaybanid authors and first of all - Ibn Ruzbihan. They are of value not only for restoration of military operations from both parties, but also for definition uluses of the Kazakh possessors, and also detailed descriptions of the Syr-Darya cities region.

So, in 1503-1504, when Muhammad Shaybani waged successful wars against the Timurids in Khurasan, the Kazakhs attacked the Prisyrdarya cities which were subject to the Uzbeks. It made Muhammad Shaybani return in Maverrannhr, and come against the Kazakhs.

A year later the Kazakhs repeated their raids to the Uzbek lands. It has caused a replay reaction on the part of Muhammad Shaybani. Muhammad Shaybani’s first and second campaigns were caused by his aspiration to finish attacks of the Kazakhs, with their territorial claims to the Uzbeks, whereas the basic forces of the Uzbek army

have were involved in Khurasan. But Muhammad Shaybani failed to cause considerable damage to the Kazakhs. He could not secure his possessions against the Kazakhs.

Descriptions of the first and second campaign of the Uzbeks by Ibn Ruzbihan: During the battles of the Kazakhs against the Uzbeks Qasim-sultan authority has increased in the Kazakh khanate. Not earlier than in autumn of 1511 Burunduk left for Maverannahr. The Supreme power in the Kazakh khanate had passed to Dzhanybek descendants, first of which was his son Qasim to be established. Since that time in the history of the Kazakh khanate comes the rising period.

At the beginning of his governing Qasim -khan took advantage of difficulties which the Uzbeks after Muhammad Shaybani-khan's death in 1510 for strengthening his power in Southern Kazakhstan. Under the power of the Kazakh khan passed the most southern the Prisyrdarya city – Sairam.

In the second decade there were changes in the political situation of Central Asia and Semirechye. First, after Muhammad Shaybani khan's death the place of Shaybani-khan vast state emerged two states: one – in Maverannahre, with the centre in Samarkand, and then – in Bukhara, another-in Khoresm with the centre in Urgench, then in Khiva, independent from Abulkhair's descendants. Secondly, in the spring of 1514 Moghul khan's sultan Said left Semirechye and intruded into Kashgaria. There, having gained the victory over the Dughlat Emirs, Sultan Said founded a new state in East Desht-i-Kipchak with the centre in Yarkand- the Mogulie-Moghul state. Thus, the Moghulistan state has disappeared from the historical arena.

The changed political situation reflected on the position of the Kazakh khanate. In the second decade of the XVI century Qasim Khan outlined borders of the Kazakh khanate in the following way: the southern border included the right bank of the Syr-Darya and a part of cities, including Sairam. The Southeast border passed on valleys and foothills of the considerable part of Semirechye. Northern border was outlined by the Ulu-Tau Mountains and Balkhash Lake, reaching the Karkaralins Mountains. The Northwest border reached the Yaik river banks. The Kazakh khanate was

involving into international relations of that time, it became known about it in Western Europe. Time of Qasim Khan's death T.I. Sultanov dates as 1518 or 1523.

Despite the considerable consolidation under Qasim Khan, the Kazakh khanate did not become decentralised state. It was found out after Qasim Khan Death when in the Kazakh khanate began the struggle for power between sultans. Besides, in the second quarter of the XVI century for Kazakhs were unfavorable foreign policy situation, namely-union of the Moghul and the Uzbek khans.

According to Mirza Muhammad Haidar Dughlati after Qasim Khan Death his son Mamash came to the throne. Details of his governing are unknown. He died from asthma because of fight armour weight in one of battles in 1522. After sultans of the Kazakh steppe were at war with each other, and Tahir, who was the son of Qasim Khan's brother Adik-sultan became the khan. It took place in 1523.

Tahir-sultan did not enjoy authority, was an extremely cruel man, possessing neither diplomatic, nor military talent. Foreign and internal political course which he had taken affected ruinously the Kazakh khanate destiny. A consequence of his failure in wars against the Mangyts and Shaybanids was loss of the main possession of the Kazakhs. But it is necessary to take into consideration that fact that it was just Tahir-sultan who managed definitively to subordinate to his influence the Semirechye population.

Thus the above mentioned Kazakh khanate however, become a stable centralized state, as was apparent immediately after Qasim Khan's death in 1518, when there were acute manifestations of dissension among the khans and sultans. At the same time, the khanate was faced by united hostility of the Moghul and Uzbek khans. Mamash (Muhammad Husayn), the son and heir of Qasim, was killed, and Tahir became khan (1523-33). But he too proved unequal to the task of keeping his subjects together. His horde of 400,000 is said to have suddenly deserted him. He had to seek the assistance of the Kyrgyz of Moghulistan, among whom he died.

Internal discord and wars continued in the reign of Tahir’s brother, Birilash (Buydash) Khan (1533-4), so much, that only 20,000 Kazakhs are said to have remained under his control. The

next khan, Tughum, another brother of Tahir Khan, suffered a shattering defeat at the hands of the Moghul khan, Abdul Rashýd (1533-60), in which Tughum himself, along with 37 'sultans' of the Kazakhs, were killed and the rumour even spread in remote areas that the Kazakhs had been annihilated as a people.

Control questions:

1. When did Muhammad Shaybani move on from Uzbek ulus to Maverannahr?
2. Why did Muhammad Shaybani provide the politic of economic isolation of the Kazakh Khans?
3. Who accompanied Muhammad Shaybani in his campaign against Kazakhs and described it in his memories?
4. What was the result of the Muhammad Shaybani's last campaign against the Kazakhs? Where did Muhammad Shaybani perish?

4.5. Internal and external position of the Kazakh Khanate in the second half of the XVI-XVII cc.

Internal discord and wars continued in the reign of Tahir's brother, Birilash (Buydash) Khan (1533-4), so much so that only 20,000 Kazakhs are said to have remained under his control. The next khan, Tughum, another brother of Tahir Khan, suffered a shattering defeat at the hands of the Moghul khan, Abdul Rashýd (1533-60), in which Tughum himself, along with 37 'sultans' of the Kazakhs, were killed and the rumour even spread in remote areas that the Kazakhs had been annihilated as a people.

But a revival of Kazakh power seems thereafter to have taken place under Qasim Khan's son, **Haqq Nazar Khan (1538-80).** The English merchant, Anthony Jenkinson, who visited Bukhara in 1558-9, heard reports of'the Cossacks of the law of Mahomet' – that is, the Kazakhs – threatening Tashkent, an Uzbek possession. Together with the Kyrgyz, who were similarly threatening Kashghar, these were held to be 'two barbarous Nations.

Of great force, living in the fields without House or Towne. These events probably had some connection with an invasion of Moghulistan that Haqq Nazar Khan undertook some time

before 1560, defeating and killing Abdul Rashýd Khan's son, Abdul Latýf.

Exploiting internal strife within the Nogay Horde, Haqq Nazar won over many of the Nogay mursas (in Persian, sons, descendants of Emirs and rulers, hence princes, nobles) to his side and annexed the territory along the left bank of the River Yaik. In 1580 Sayfý, the author of a Turkish work, held the Kazakhs to number 200,000 families. He described them as Hanafite Muslims (as were most of the Muslims in Transoxania). They had sheep and camels, and exported to Bukhara coats made of very fine wool. They were nomads and had their dwellings on carts.

The aged Shighay Khan (1580–2), a grandson of Dzhanybek Khan, succeeded Haqq Nazar, and the next khan was his son, **Tevke (Tevekkel, Tevkel, possibly a Turkic form of Tavakkul, 1582–98)**. Tevke Khan succeeded gradually in consolidating his authority in the khanate. He sent an embassy to Tsar Feodor in 1594 seeking support against the Uzbek ruler Abdullah Khan (1557–98) and the Siberian khan Küchüm. The Russian documents refer to him as the 'Kazakh and Kalmuk king', which suggests that he also had some Kalmuks as his subjects or chiefs. This might have been the result of an earlier conflict with the Kalmuks in which Tevke had carried out a raid into Kalmuk (Oirat) territory, which had in return brought upon the Kazakhs 'a devastating irruption of the infidels'.

In their conflicts with the Uzbeks, the Kazakhs felt at a particular disadvantage in having to rely on bows and arrows alone, whereas the Uzbeks also had firearms. One objective behind the embassy to Moscow in 1594 was to secure these weapons even at the cost of accepting vassalage to the tsar.

Just before Abdullah Khan's death in 1598, Tevke launched an invasion of the Uzbek dominions and defeated, at a place between Tashkent and Samarkand, a large army that Abdullah Khan had sent against him. In 1598, after Abdullah Khan's death, Tevke raised 'an immense host from among the tribes of West Turkistan and steppe-inhabiting Uzbeks'and seized 'Aksi, Andijan, Tashkent and Samarkand'. His army of '70-80,000', however, suffered a setback at Bukhara – which was nominally under the last Shaybanid khan, Pir Muhammad Khan – and he retreated to Tashkent, where he died after

an illness. Tevke's conquests were soon retaken by the Uzbeks, but Tashkent and Turkestan remained with the Kazakhs until 1723.

In the seventeenth century Kazakhstan presented the picture of a politically fragmented country. No stable economic and political ties could be formed between the Kazakh *zhuz*s.

The difficulties standing in the way of uniting the Kazakh lands into a stable centralized state may be attributed to the economic backwardness of the Kazakh khanate and the predominance of a natural economy, marked by the decline of the towns in southern Kazakhstan.

Feuding increased in the first quarter of the seventeenth century, when Ishim (Esim) Khan (1598-1628) succeeded his brother Tevke. Some of the more powerful Kazakh sultans became virtually independent of the khan. Prominent among them was Tursun Muhammad, who, installed by Imam Quli Khan, the Uzbek ruler of Bukhara, proclaimed himself, khan at Tashkent (1614-27) while Ishim ruled in Turkestan. After Ishim Khan, the situation of the Kazakh khanate deteriorated even further; the Dzhungars seized part of Semirechye, subjugating the Kazakh nomads in the area. Ishim's son Jahangýr (1630-80) won a great victory against the Dzhungars in the early 1640s but ultimately lost his life in a battle with the Dzhungar ruler Galdan (1671-97). When the throne passed in 1680 to Tauke (or Tauka) Khan (1680-1718), he took up the cudgels against the old nobility, and brought in new nobles, *b* s or *beg*s (lords), of his own, to play a major role in the khan's councils. How far this improved matters is difficult to say.

The Dzhungar invasion

The situation on the eastern frontiers of the Kazakh khanate grew worse at the beginning of the seventeenth century. Whereas a relatively strong Kazakh khanate had been faced, in the late sixteenth – early seventeenth century, by disunited Oirat (Kalmuk) tribes, the balance began to shift in the second quarter of the seventeenth century in favour of the Dzhungar taijis (taishis, nobles, chiefs) within the Oirat fold. The Dzhungar chief Khara Khula (d. 1634) made a prolonged effort to unite the Oirats. Under his son Baatur (1634-53), the Dzhungar Empire may be deemed to have been fully

established: he took the imperial title of khongtaiji (khongtaishi). Ba'atur persistently made war against the Kazakhs from bases in Dzhungaria (northern Xinjiang, China), comprising most of Moghulistan. His son, Galdan Boshoghtu (1671-97), continuing the wars, seized practically all of Semirechye from the Kazakh khan Tauke in the early 1680 s. However, his preoccupation with a campaign against China in his later years somewhat weakened the pressure on the Kazakhs.

Relations between the Kazakhs and the Dzhungars deteriorated sharply after the accession of Cewang Arabtan (Tsewangraptan) as Dzhungar chief (1688–1727), when a fresh series of military conflicts began. The Dzhungars inflicted defeat after defeat on the Kazakhs, making off with captives and cattle, seizing pastures and property, and slaughtering entire clans and villages.

This is how Valikhanov described the situation of the Kazakhs early in the eighteenth century: 'Their lands were threatened from all sides, their cattle were driven away and entire families were taken captive by the Dzhungars, Volga Kalmuks, Yaik Cossacks and Bashkirs.

In 1717 Kaip Khan and Abulkhairconducted a major campaign with a force of 30,000 men against the Dzhungar khanate, but the Kazakh levies suffered a crushing defeat on the River Ayaguz.

In 1723 the Dzhungar rulers suddenly moved their armies into Kazakhstan. This is the year of the beginning of the 'great calamity' in the traditional Kazakh oral tales called the Aqtaban-shubirindi and the Alqaqol-sulama. Taken unawares, the Kazakhs were obliged to retreat, abandoning cattle, covered wagons and other possessions. Many were killed by the Dzhungar invaders, and many more perished while crossing the rivers Talas, Borolday, Arys, Chirchik and Syr Darya. Sayram, Turkestan and Tashkent were occupied by the invaders.

Most of the clans of the Middle Zhuz migrated to Samarkand, while the Little Zhuz retreated into the territories of Khiva and Bukhara. The only way out of the situation was through an effort to expel the enemy; the uprising was led by the batirs (bahadurs, intrepid warriors, troop-leaders) Bugenbay, Raimbek (Rahým Beg), Tailaq, Saureq, Malaisare and Dzhanybek Khan. The organized

struggle began in 1726, when the troops of all the three zhuzs began to act together. In the south-eastern area of the Turgay steppe, on the banks of the rivers Bulanti and Beleutti, in the locality of Qara-syr, which subsequently acquired the name of Qalmaq kirilgan ('the place where the Kalmuks perished'), there was a major battle between the Kazakhs and the Dzhungars, in which the latter were defeated.

The serious situation on the eastern frontier having made it imperative for the three zhuzs to join forces, Abulkhair, khan of the Little Zhuz, was chosen to command the troops. The victory gained by the Kazakhs in the locality of Anrakay in 1730 came about because the Kazakh troops of all three zhuzes fought side by side. The Dzhungar forces were obliged to retreat eastwards back into the territory of the Dzhungar khanate itself.

The unity of the Kazakh hordes did not, however, last long. The ties between the hordes, especially those of the Little and Middle Zhuzs with the Great Zhuz, were not strong enough to sustain the alliance. Moreover, the Little and Middle Zhuzes were now themselves broken up into separate domains. The threat of a new attack by the Dzhungar khanate was not eliminated by the success of 1730. Although the Dzhungar Empire was much weakened by a large cession of territory to the Chinese in 1732, the Dzhungar ruler Galdan Cering (Galdan Tseren) (1727-45) continued to press hard upon the Kazakhs.

But the overthrow of the Dzhungar Empire by the Chinese enabled the Kazakhs, under Khan Ablai of the Middle Horde, to drive out the Dzhungars from Kazakh lands in 1758.

The Kazakh khanate was obliged to accept the suzerainty of Russia partly because of the military and political situation that had developed owing to the Dzhungar excursions and the consequential economic difficulties, the fragmentation of the khanate and civil strife.

The Kazakh khanate was obliged to accept the suzerainty of Russia partly because of the military and political situation that had developed owing to the Dzhungar excursions and the consequential economic difficulties, the fragmentation of the khanate and civil strife.

Kazakh – Russian relations in the XVII-first third of the XVIII cc.

In 1726 there was a meeting in the Karakalpak steppes between a Russian envoy, Mulla Maksyuta Yunusov (Mulla Maqsud b. Yunus), and Abulkhair Khan, then leader of the Little Horde. Following the negotiations, Abulkhair Khan sent a mission to St Petersburg headed by Koybagar Kobekov for the purpose of gaining the 'protection' of Russia.

On 8 September 1730 a mission from Abulkhair Khan headed by Seitkul (Seyed-Qul) Koydagulov and Kutlumbet Koshtaev came to Ufa and petitioned Empress Anna Ivanovna (1730-40) for the incorporation of the Little Zhuz into the Russian empire.

On 19 February 1731 the empress signed a deed addressed to Abulkhair Khan and the whole of the Kazakh people' on their voluntary acceptance of Russian nationality.

A special mission headed by A. I. Tevkelev was dispatched to the Kazakh steppes on 30 April 1731 to inform the Kazakhs of the deed and to administer the oath of allegiance to them. On 10 October Tevkelev summoned the Kazakh leaders to a meeting at which the legal act on the voluntary incorporation of the Little Horde into Russia was signed by Abulkhair Khan, followed by Bukenbay, Iset and his brother Mırza Khuday Nazar, and further Kazakh chiefs.

On 15 December 1731 Tevkelev, Abulkhair Khan and Bukenbay sent emissaries to Semeke Khan of the Middle Zhuz with the proposal that he should accept subjection to Russia. Semeke expressed the willingness of his Horde to enter the Russian empire, the oath of allegiance was administered to him and he àffixed his seal.

The sultans and begs of the Great Zhuz, Qodar and Tole, and batirs Satay, Khangeldy and Bolek then approached the empress herself directly with a request for admission to the Russian empire. On 19 September 1738 Empress Anna confirmed by deed to Jolbarys Khan that the Great Horde had been admitted into Russia. However, such was the remoteness of the Great Horde from Russia, and so vulnerable was it to pressure from Dzhungaria, that it was difficult to give effect to the incorporation of these Kazakh lands into Russia. It was, indeed, not until 1846 that the Kazakhs of the Great Horde actually accepted Russian suzerainty.

Meanwhile, from the middle of the eighteenth century onwards, Russia began to build lines of defence in Kazakhstan, along the rivers Yaik, Irtysh and Ishim. The defence works afforded great scope for the Russians to colonize Kazakhstan. They acquired the best and most fertile land, with the result that the area of grazing land was reduced and traditional migrations were disrupted. The tsarist government also issued a number of decrees restricting the movements of the Kazakhs.

4.6. Material and spiritual culture of Kazakh people in XVI-XVII centuries

Herding, farming and urban life

Nomadic and semi-nomadic herding was the principal economic activity of the Kazakhs. The animals reared were mainly sheep, horses, camels and cattle. The meat and milk of sheep served as food, and their skins and wool were used in making clothes, footwear, vessels and many other objects of daily use. Horse-breeding was no less important.

Haydar Dughlat aptly quotes the Kazakh khan Qasim's words: 'We are men of the desert, and here there is nothing in the way of riches or formalities. Our most costly possessions are our horses, our favorite food their flesh, our most enjoyable drink their milk and the products of it. Kazakh pastoralists often moved seasonally with their herds of animals from one location to another to make the best use of available pastures. Wheeled transport was widely used, though horseback was the normal mode of travel. Because fodder was not usually put by for the winter, there were mass deaths of animals (known as zhuts) if deep snow covered the steppes for too long or there was a prolonged drought. Nomadic life was thus even more subject to natural disasters than settled life. In addition to stock-breeding the Kazakhs were also involved in farming and enjoyed a settled mode of life; others lived in towns. From the late fifteenth to the seventeenth century, life in the Syr Darya region and Semirechye became largely sedentary. The development of towns and settlements, and of agriculture itself, was greatly supported by exchanges with nomads and semi-nomads.

The town of Sighnak retained its importance as the major economic and political centre of the eastern Desht-i-Kipchak. The town finally came under the permanent authority of the Kazakh khans in 1598. Nomadic stock-breeders came to Sighnak, driving their beasts before them ('fat sheep, horses and camels', in the words of the author of the Mihman nama-i Bukhara) and delivering the produce of animal husbandry (meat, skins, hides, wool and woollen goods) and furs. Such valuable goods as 'fur coats of sable and squirrel, taut bows, arrows of white birch, silk cloth and other costly wares' were also brought to Sighnak to be sold.

During the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the city of Turkestan became the most important centre of southern Kazakhstan. Ibn Ruzbihan calls Yasi 'the capital of the rulers of Turkistan'. Written sources contain references to many settlements around Yasi (modern Turkestan) that together formed a large farming oasis, especially the settlements of IKhan, Qarnaq, Qarachuq and Suri. Ishim Khan made Turkestan his capital, a place at which much of the cultural and political life of the entire Syr Darya strip was centred. The Kazakh khans, like the previous rulers of West Turkistan, also attempted to maintain the role of the city as a centre of Islamic learning and rites.

Sauran retained its importance as an urban centre. It was one of the strongest fortresses of the region. To quote Ibn Ruzbihan again, 'the town is surrounded by a high wall, which cannot be rapidly taken by armed force, and around it there is an unassailable moat.'

Like other towns in southern Kazakhstan, Sauran was the centre of a farming district from which it obtained its food supplies; apart from being a grain exporter, it was reputed around 1520 for its 'incalculable wealth' and 'the comforts of the vilayet'.

During the final third of the fifteenth century and early in the sixteenth century, Otrar remained one of the region's major administrative centres. Artefacts unearthed during excavations at Otrar in recent years point to the prosperity of the town and the surrounding farming district in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.In the late Middle Ages Sayram was at the heart of a densely populated agricultural district at the junction of the trade routes from Transoxania to the Desht-i-Kipchak and Semirechye.

There are references in our texts to other towns in the Syr Darya region that were also surrounded by farming districts, such as Suzaq, Arquq, Uzgend and Aq-Kurgan.

Crafts

Written sources and archaeological finds demonstrate that the Kazakhs practiced many trades, prominent among which were blacksmithing, jeweler making, leatherwork, tailoring and shoe-making. Woodworkers carved beautifully shaped, richly ornamented wooden bowls, elegant goblets for the drinking of kumiss (qumis, qumiz) (fermented mare's milk) and large round basins. They also made wooden components for yurts, beds, chests, low round tables and children's cots. Blacksmiths fashioned armour and weapons, such as bows, quivers, shields, knives, swords, spears and arrows, and the usual range of metal tools for farming and everyday household use. Leather-workers and saddlers made horse trappings, harness and other fittings for carriages and pack horses; and straps and fastenings for the awnings of yurts. Carpet- and rug-making were widely developed. Clothes, felt, carpets and furnishings for yurts were mainly the work of women. Master potters were renowned for their range of crockery, including glazed wares.

Craftsmen who were able to impart an artistic quality to their products were held in high esteem and addressed as sheber (master craftsman). Urban craftsmen were members of guilds and lived by their rules. In the course of excavations archaeologists have uncovered the workshops of potters, blacksmiths, jewelers, coppersmiths and brick-makers.

Kazakh military organization and arts

The Kazakhs did not have a standing army, but raised levies as required. A detachment was an independent military unit: the chief of the clan was its commander and each detachment had its own battle flag and war cry (uran). A few such autonomous units formed the host of an ulus (familial or tribal domain). The leader of the ulus was also the leader of the host, which had its main banner and its own war cry. The khan was the commander-in-chief of all the hosts; he personally stood at the head of his troops in battle and was

expected to share their hardships and dangers. Sources indicate that the Kazakh rulers had, on average, 30-50,000 mounted warriors. Mobility was a feature of the light cavalry of the steppe dwelling nomads, who were able to assemble large forces for an attack at any time and in any place.

The main weapons of the Kazakhs during the period were the sword and the bow. Other arms mentioned are war axes, bludgeons, one-handed maces, two-handed clubs, and long spears decorated with horsehair tassels and fitted with a hook for dragging an opponent from the saddle. We have a reference to a warrior sultan from the Desht-i-Kipchak in the following terms: 'Over his chest he wore a shirt of mail as blue as the sky, on his head there was a sparkling helmet with a helmet liner, and round his waist was a belt from which hung a sword.' Firearms were not very common, but the Kazakhs knew how to make 'good gunpowder', and also how to smelt lead and copper ore.

There is much information in the sources on the military art of the Turco-Mongol nomadic tribes and peoples. If the military commanders thought it pointless to engage in a cavalry skirmish, the warriors dismounted, and having fastened the reins of their horses to their belts, rained down arrows on the enemy and sought to prevent the opponents' advance with spear thrusts. If the enemy attacked unexpectedly, making it impossible for the defenders to form ranks, they strove to close the flanks and form a circle, wheeling round as they fought, 'in the Mongol fashion'. In attack the nomads used a method which had its own special name – tulgama (tulgamish). Both these words come from the Turkic verb tulgamak – to encircle, wind round, turn, spin, and whirl. As a method of warfare, tulgama means to turn, make a flanking movement and attack the enemy on the flank or in the rear.

Military prowess was highly esteemed and a person who 'cut off more heads and spilled more blood' than others enjoyed general respect. We know from fifteenth-century sources that outstanding swordsmen who were repeatedly successful on the battlefield were awarded the title or style of tolu-batir or tolu-bahadur (perfect hero) or bogatyr (complete hero), i.e. a person of boundless courage, steadfastness and strength.

Dwellings

Most of the population of Kazakhstan, whose occupation was nomadic and semi-nomadic herding, lived in movable dwellings of various shapes, sizes and designs. In warm weather the herdsmen and their families lived in light portable dwellings, while in cold weather they lived for the most part (nomads excepted) in warm, permanent housing – dug-outs and dwellings above ground, the names for which were Zheru, Qara-tam and Shohola. The summer dwellings of the Kazakhs were of two types: the felt tent or yurt, and the covered wagon or kuyme (kheyma). The most usual form was the yurt, which is an easily assembled dwelling. It was circular in shape, outwardly resembling a rotunda. The base of the yurt was formed by the wall (kerege), over which a dome-shaped vault of radially arranged poles was erected, with their lower ends fastened to the wall and their upper ends held by a circle of wood (shaniraq) forming the uppermost point of the dome. The yurts of wealthy people and nobles were noteworthy for their elegance and costly furnishings; their frames were often decorated with bone inlay, and the interior was hung with many-coloured carpets and expensive textiles.

Covered wagons formed another common type of mobile home among the Kazakhs. As described by Ibn Ruzbihan: their homes [those of the Kazakhs] are constructed in the shape of bullock-carts (caraba), mounted on wheels (garduna) and curved like the vault of the heavens. Camels and horses draw them from one camp site to another, strung out one behind the other like a caravan train, and if they all start to move together in this way, the trains may extend for 100 Mongol farsangs (about 600 km), with no more than a single pace between each of them.

As mentioned previously, the Kazakhs also constructed permanent dwellings: dug-outs and houses. Considerable groups of Kazakhs lived in rural settlements and in winter camps (kstaus, qestaus), usually along river-banks, in mountain gorges. Permanent, settled areas were a more advanced type of rural settlement, sometimes protected by walls and ditches.

They varied in size and could have as many as 500 inhabitants. Materials from the archaeological excavations at Otrar and other settlements enable us to distinguish the traditional type of urban

dwelling. The basic and most simple living unit was a room with an aywan (arched portal, the chamber open at the outside). Practically all domestic functions were combined in the single warmest and most comfortable room, which had a stove (tandir, tanur; Persian, tand¯ur). This room served as bedroom, dining room and kitchen. The walls of the houses were built of unbaked brick, without foundations. Frame construction was also used, usually for internal partitions. Ceilings were flat, supported on a central elm or poplar beam. The roof was made of reeds with a top coating of clay.

Architecture

According to the written sources, the finest architectural works of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries were the tombs of the Kazakh khans Dzhanybek and Qasim Khan in the necropolis of the town of Saraychik.

A clear idea of the buildings of the sixteenth-eighteenth centuries may be obtained from monuments that have survived in relatively good condition. First and foremost are the mausoleums of Karmakchi-Ata and Saraman-Ata in the lower reaches of the Syr Darya.

The first is a cube-shaped building with a dome in the form of a truncated cone – one of the traditional types of tomb in Kazakhstan. Other monuments in the lower reaches of the Syr Darya take the customary form of hipped-roof buildings. They include the mausoleums of Qara-batir, Tore-batir and Tore-tam. The monuments of central Kazakhstan, in the Ulutau district, are more diversified, although retaining the principle of hipped-roof construction.

Polyhedral and ellipsoid mausoleums are also found here.

Different again are the architectural monuments of the Mangishlaq (Manqeshlaq) region, in the basins of the Emba, Sagiz, Uil and Khobda rivers. The monuments there were built exclusively of white limestone, a material that is easy to work, polish and ornament.

Wall paintings in mausoleums have a special place in Kazakh folk art. Their subjects were usually domestic, hunting and military scenes and episodes from the life of the dead.

Applied arts

The Kazakhs live in a world of ornament. Their traditional domestic decor is embellished with patterns. There are no household items untouched by decorative ornamentation. Literally everything is decorated – utensils, crockery, weapons and clothing. The ornamental folk art of the Kazakhs is epitomized in the yurt. Among yurt furnishings, the highest artistic value is attributed to multicolored woven strips (baskurs) on a claret-coloured ground and narrow polychrome ribbons on a milky-white ground (bau), used as draping on the wall and the vault.

Mats in many colours made of chee grass interwoven with variegated woollen thread or silk cord furnish striking examples of Kazakh decorative art. They usually come in soft, delicate shades. Multicoloured felt and woven rugs, carpets (alashas), embroidered curtains (shimildiks), felt pouches for the walls of the yurt (ayaq-qabs) and brightly hued and patterned chest covers (sandiq-qabs) are all used in furnishing the yurt. Decorative embroidery is very popular in Kazakh folk art.

Horse harness, leather saddle-cloths, and belts worn by men and women are decorated with punch-work. Objects made of bone are frequently decorated with open-work. The favourite motifs for bone carving are circles and spirals, and, rather less frequently, rhomboids and triangles.

Some of the finest examples of Kazakh applied art are to be found in necklaces and pectoral ornaments for women, medallions to adorn girls' braids and pendants decorated with filigree, gemstones and pearls. There is a wealth of ornamentation on bracelets, rings and silver cases decorated by carving, engraving, inlay, cloisonné work and enameling.

The designs are usually based on geometric and floral patterns. The motifs of Kazakh decoration are many, and strict rules govern their reproduction and combination. The main elements are cosmological, zoomorphic, floral and geometric.

The colour scheme of background and design is based on a rigorous system of colour composition. Black is generally used to make the decoration stand out more boldly, rather than white on a black background. Kazakhs love the combination of black and

raspberry, and of blue with light shades. Some colours have a traditional symbolic significance. For example, blue is the symbol of the sky; red of fire and the sun; white of truth, joy and happiness; yellow of the mind and grief; black of earth; and green of youth and spring.

Religion

Islam became the official religion of the Kazakhs in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

Its main centres were Turkestan, Khwarazm, Bukhara and Astrakhan. Merchants played an important role in the spread of Islam among the Kazakhs. While describing the events of 1508-9, Ibn Ruzbihan wrote that 'Kazakh merchants study the precepts of On Kazakh dresses, jewellery and their way of life in the sixteenth century, Mohammedanism and now their khans and sultans are Muslims. They read the Quran, say their prayers and send their children to school.'Islam did not, however, strike deep roots among the ordinary people, most of whom remained unaffected by its dogma, tending instead to cling to the beliefs of the pre-Islamic period, based on the worship of Tengri. The concept of Tengri was adapted to the new conditions: the deity gradually took on a monotheistic form and began to be identified with Allah. It is not by chance that the dual concepts of 'Tengri-Allah', 'Tin-Aruakh' and 'Martu-Shaytan' came into popular use.

Despite the teachings of Islam, the people long continued to worship their ancestors and kept images of them. The old rites were especially observed by the nomads, who were little affected by Islam. All these beliefs were denounced by the Islamic clergy (culama'). The shaykhs (head men, tribal leaders) and qazıs (judges) of Bukhara, acting at the instigation of Shaybanı Khan, drew up a fatw a (legal opinion) in which it was asserted that since the Kazakhs were idolaters, the khan should proclaim a holy war against them.

The Kazakhs worshipped the spirits of the earth (Zher-ana) and water (Su-ana), to whom they consecrated unusually shaped mountains and cliffs, caves, groves, lone trees and springs. They also continued to worship the tutelary spirits of sheep (Sholpan-ata), cows (Zengi-ata), horses (Kambar-ana) and camels (Oysil-qara). Offerings

of mare's milk were made to the moon and sun, with prayers for obtaining the life-giving gift of water and dew. Fire worship (Ot-ana) played a very important part in the life of the Kazakhs. Fire was regarded as the tutelary spirit of home and hearth.

Some elements in the burial customs of the Kazakhs also dated back to ancient beliefs. On the death of a warrior, his bow, spear, saddle and the head of his favorite horse were placed beside him in his tomb, and food and drink were left for him. The custom of the wake was observed when a man died at home. On the following day the deceased was subjected to purification by fire, after which he was buried. Nobles were buried in holy places: for example, near the mausoleum of Khwaja Ahmad Yasawı in Turkestan, mausoleums called kumbez (Persian, gumbad, dome) or sagana-tam of richly ornamented fired brick were built for members of the nobility. In the Mangishlaq and the north Caspian regions such mausoleums were built of coquina.

Control questions:

1. To make a bibliographic list on the theme: «Fomation of the Kazakh khanate».
2. To read the following articles: Пищулина К.А. Присырдарьинские города и их значение в истории казахских ханств в XV-XVII веках // Казахстан в XV-XVIII веках: Вопросы социально-политической истории. – Алма-Ата, 1969. – С. 5-49; Ее же: Письменные восточные источники о при сырдарьинских городах Казахстана XIV-XVII вв. // Средневековая городская культура Казахстана и Средней Азии. – Алма-Ата, 1983. – С. 165-176. To write an essay on the theme: «K.A. Pishchulina's contribution to studying medieval history of Kazakhstan».
3. Answer the question: «N.E. Masanov's contribution in studying the problem Formation of the Kazakh Nation».
4. To make a bibliographic list of M.K. Abuseitova's works about the Kazakh Khanate and write an essay on the theme: M.K. Abuseitova's contribution in studying medieval history of Kazakhstan.
5. To read the book: Султанов Т.И. Кочевые племена Приаралья (Вопросы этнической и социальной истории. – М., 1982). And to write a reaction paper of 300 words on it.
6. To read the book: Басин В.Я. Россия и казахские ханства в XVI-XVIII вв. – Алма-Ата, 1971 and to make list of Russian-Kazakh embassies in the XVII-the beginning of the XVIII cc.

7. What types of classification of written sources on history of the Kazakh Khanate do you know?
8. The significance of the Shaybanid sources in studying the Kazakh Khanate.
9. Compare the evidence of the Tarik-i-Rashidi and Bahr Al-Asrar about the Kazakh Khanate.
10. What disputable questions on the problem of Kazakh Khanate formation can you mark?
11. Make a logical scheme on the question of «interrelations of the Kazakhs with the Uzbeks in the XVI century».
12. In which source was the term «Kazakhstan» used for the first time
13. When did ethnonims «Kazakh» and «Uzbek» divide?
14. Why did the struggle for power over the population of the East Dasht-I Qipchag turn intothe war for possessing Prisyrdarya region?
15. What were the consequences of Tavakkul's campaigns to Maverannahr at the end of the XVI century?
16. What dynasty did ascend the throne in Maverannahr at the beginning of the XVII century?
17. How did political rights of sultans in the Kazakh society expressed?

Seminar tasks

1. Written sources on history of the Kazakh Khanate.
2. Formation and strengthening the Kazakh Khanate (the middle of the XV-beginning of the XVI cc.).
3. Political history of the Kazakh Khanate in XVI century.
4. Internal and external situation of the Kazakh Khanate in the XVII centuries.
5. Culture of the Kazakh people in XVI-XVIII cc.

V Part

KAZAKHSTAN LANDS IN THE STRUCTURE OF THE RUSSIAN EMPIRE, 1731-1917

5.1. Different approaches to the study of the nature, objectives and policies techniques of the Russian Empire in relation to the national borderlands

Russia's policy to the national borderlands were studied by several generations of Russian and foreign historians on the basis of various ideological and methodological concepts. For the analysis were highlighted the pre-October, Soviet and post-Soviet periods in the development of historical thought, characterized by the unity of main positions and views on the objectives, methods and results of the Russian policy. At the same time these works differ with ideological approaches, and inside the periods there is a variety of assessment nuances. In the pre-October period the political aspects were considered from the point of view of the Russian Empire state interests, the monarchist ideology the Orthodox world outlook, the patronage of the Russian civilized nation towards «wild» nomadic tribes and traditions formed successes of Russian arms. In the XVIII century when Russia formed as a multinational state, there appeared works of historians, publicists, writers who gave at the disposal of Russian politicians' justification and motivation for advancing to the East. The authors of the works were scientists-participants of academic expeditions, or professional scientists-orientalists, but also statesmen, officers of the General Staff, officials of provincial administrations. Despite the fact that the level of researches was different, they were united by a common goal – to justify the civilizing mission of Russia in the East, on the basis of the Eurocentrism conceptual provisions.

In the vision of the famous Swiss historian A. Kappeler the essence of this concept was the fact that «under the influence of normative models of the mankind progressive evolution from the stage of hunters, gatherers and nomadic pastoralists to the highest stage of sedentary farmers, hunters and nomads were seen as uncivilized savages who were on the lowest stage of development. They had to be civilized, turned into sedentary peasants and civilians»[8].

In the XIX century was forming the basic theories and concepts for studying the problems of Russian policy in the non-Russian border regions. But the most important - these theories and concepts included in the real politics, for ideological justification the Russians' movement to the east: the gathering of lands or performance of the Orthodox Christian Mission. These theories were evident in inner-governmental debates or reasoning of the emperies ideologists (theories of the natural borders' or on marine the continental character of the Russian Empire, the colonial policy, striving for carrying the European civilization to nomadic peoples).

One of the most common among historians was the «natural borders» theory. In accordance with it the Russian progressive movement to Kazakhstan and Central Asia was explained as a natural course of human history for the recovery and spreading the Aryan race.

Close to this theory also approaches the direction that justified of Russia's conquests with ethnographic and geographical factors on which the Russian state, located on the plain tended to expand. It is emphasized that the historical role of the people in Eastern Europe went to the Russians, while there was noted a lack of economic and political goals. In the Russian historiography reflected the direction, preaching the exclusiveness of the Russian nation. Its proponents stressed that good neighborly relations with the people of the steppes could be achieved only by force of arms. The most widespread theory among researchers was that the conquest of Russia was connected with the implementation of the «civilizing mission», based on the view of the low level of civilization of the nomads. For

[8] Kappeler A. Yuzhnyj i vostochnyj frontir Rossii v XVI-XVIII v. // Av Imperio. Rossijskaya imperiya: okrainy i granicy. – Kazan', 2003. – № 1. – S. 61.

example, a representative of the public school S.M. Solovyov followed the concept of naturally determined and inevitable destruction of retarded in their development nomadic peoples in contact with their civilization and did not see any historical perspectives in their development. Nomadic peoples were regarded by him as a «disorganized», «predatory hordes without any state, reasonable beginning». S.M. Soloviev believed that if with the Western powers it was necessary to deal through diplomatic negotiations, but in the east «with steppe predatory hordes this means was not effective». In the basis of S.M. Solovyov's interpretation of individual people's history of Russia were the theses of the Russian colonization content – «fighting against Asians», «struggle of the forest against steppe», «the struggle of Christianity against Islam».

The Great Russian historian of the late XIX – early XX centuries. Kliuchevsky in his concept of formation of the Russian State called the period from the beginning of the XVII to the Sredniy XIX century. «All-Russian, imperial-nobiliary». Kliuchevsky said: «The history of Russia is the history of the country that colonized, the area of colonizing in it expands along with the state territory». Colonization movements, in his view, played a profiling role in the life of the Russian people. This process led to Russia spreading in different regions in accordance with national and geographical interests of the empire[9].

Kliuchevsky's views about reasons and ways of widening the Russian Empire became a starting-point of many subsequent works, including special works devoted to relations of Russia with the Kazakhs. The distinctive feature of the Kazakh people historiography was the fact, that history was studied by not professional historians, but office-workers, publicists, officials of the Military Department. Therefore, works published by them were not always special historical researches[10]. The exception was A. Levshin's three-volume

[9] Ibid. P.49-50.

[10] Mejer L. Kirgizskaya step' Orenburgskogo vedomstva // Materialy dlya geografii i statistiki Rossii Orenburgskogo vedomstva, sobrannye oficerami General'nogo shtaba. – T. 10: Kirgizskaya step' orenburgskogo vedomstva – Spb., 1865; Krasovskij N. I. Oblast' sibirskih kirgizov // Materialy dlya geografii i statistiki Rossii… – T.1: Oblast' sibirskih kirgizov. – Spb., 1868; Lobysevich F. Postupatel'noe dvizhenie Rossii v Srednyuyu Aziyu v torgovom i diplomaticheskom otnosheniyah. – SPB, 1900.

research, the first monographic research on history of Kazakhstan, based on sources, and also the well-known orientalist V.V. Velyaminov-Zernov's research[11].

Reasons for joining the Kazakhs the Russian citizenship researchers interpreted as Abul Khair Khan's personal initiative, a beneficial deal dictated by selfish goals of the Khan (L. Meyer, F. Lobysevich). A. Levshin, A. Dobrosmyslov emphasized the voluntary nature of the citizenship caused by the instability of the situation with the Khan's power and foreign policy danger. I. Kraft among the causes of the accession of Kazakhstan to Russia marked out internal turmoils, internecine discords and inter-clan fighting. However, a number of authors in their works underlined definitely official point of view of the tsarism colonial policy, which in the XIX century carried out so-called «peaceful conquest of the steppes», intending to speed up the «eternal allegiance» of the Kazakh zhuzes. For example, in the framework of the historiographical trend «forward movemen» of the Orthodox-Christian civilization to Asia, the authors «tried to find the key» to the strange fact that nearly a century the Russian Empire ruled the Kazakhs only nominally. The officer of the General Staff L. Meyer saw the cause of this phenomenon in the erroneous government techniques, when the government had broken up the «fundamental principle» – the freedom of the Kazakhs in the election of the Khan. He believed that the adoption of the Khan's dignity in Abul Khair Khan's clan did not correspond to the circumstances of the Russian policy.

F. Lobysevich believed that some unsuccessful actions of imperial administration among which the basic mistake was the confirmation of Abul Khair Khan's power, whose position was very unstable, prevented from strong strengthening tsarism in the Kazakh steppe. The general conclusion of F. Lobysevich was the point that the Kazakh's nominal citizenship secured Russian borders and the

[11] Levshin A. I. Opisanie kirgiz-kazach'ih, ili kirgiz-kajsackih, ord i stepej. – 2-e izd. – Almaty, 1996; Vel'yaminov-Zernov V.V. istoricheskie izvestiya i kirgiz-kajsakah i snosheniya Rossii so Srednej Azieyu so vremen konchiny Abulhair-hana (1748-1765). – T. 1. – Ufa, 1853.

movement of trade[12]. The objectives of strengthening the Kazakh's citizenship were also given in A. Maksheev's works. He wrote that the Kazakhs were still independent and did not have any obligations with respect to Russia[13].

Thus, problems of the Kazakhs' citizenship were raised in the Russian historiography. Among the authors there was a unity of views on the voluntary taking of the oath. Among the reasons for appealing to Russia, were underlined an external threat, internal political instability and Abul Khair Khan Khan's selfish plans. In addition in pre-revolutionary historiography was raised a question about a nominal character of the Kazakhs' citizenship. The authors emphasized the mistakes of local government officials. They referred the actual submission by the Sredniy of the XIX century. For historiographical trend «progressive movement in Russia» was characteristic to connect failures of the Russian policy in establishing the real dependence of the Kazakhs with the activities of «short-sighted» and «cowardly border chiefs». They were «guilty» of hampering the establishing process of the real subordination of the Kazakhs. Only the activities of the first Orenburg governor of the I. Neplyuev received approval in the pre-revolutionary literature. V. Vitevsky on the extensive factual material showed the governor's merits in the colonization of the Orenburg region and called him Peter the Great, of the Orenburg region.

As it is known, the Kazakh state in Russia was called Cossack or Kirghiz – Cossack Horde[14]. The officer of the General Staff, Lieutenant Colonel L. Meyer, who made materials on the Kazakh steppe of the Orenburg department for the collection «Materials for the Russian Statistics geography» in 1865 explained the title of the Kazakh Khanate: «Kirghiz – the name imposed on the people by foreigners; neither now no in the old days the inhabitants of the steppe so called themselves, but A. Levshin it seems not mistaken, attributing it to other people, that is the Buruts, now known under the

[12] Lobysevich F. Postupatel'noe dvizhenie v Srednyuyu Aziyu v torgovom i diplomaticheskо-voennom otnosheniyah. – Spb., 1900. – S. 38-39.

[13] Maksheev A. Istoricheskij obzor Turkestana i nastupatel'noe dvizhenie na nego russkih. – Spb., 1890. – S. 103.

[14]Rossiya i Kazahstan: problemy vzaimodejstviya (XVI – XX veka) // Rossiya, Zapad i musul'manskij Vostok v kolonial'nuyu ehpohu. – Spb., 1996. – S. 9.

name dikokamenny Kirghiz living in the foothills of the Alatau and around Lake Issyk-Kul (contemporary Kyrgyz.)».

«This tribe has always been hostile to our present-day Kyrgyz. However, there was a clan among the Kazakhs called Kirghiz, but it separated long ago from this clan and it seems now lives between Kokand and Chinese Turkestan. Maybe the Russian first encountered in Siberia with this tribe and its name transferred to the entire Kazakh people. The generic name «Cossack» call themselves the Kirghizs [1865] to this day. This is their real name»[15].

The initial period of the Soviet historiography was the period of formation of Marxist-Leninist methodology. The most prominent representative of the new Marxist historiography was M. Pokrovsky, in whose works Russian policy in the national borderlines was evaluated solely as aggressive. In M. Pokrovsky's works was emphasized the exposure of «tsarism atrocities», was produced a picture of «merciless massacres of the natives, the wild exploitation of the population», At the Institute of Red Professors, M.N. Pokrovsky conducted a seminar on the colonial policy of the tsarist government. Therefore, his concept on the expansion of the Russian territory at the expense of outlying districts, which he regarded as «an absolute evil» for the non-Russian peoples, was widespread among professional historians (formed the whole «M. Pokrovsky's school»).

Equally important for the dissemination of this concept was the resolution of the meeting of historians of the East, which stated on the transferring the center of gravity in the works of historians on the development of colonial policies, both in Russia and other foreign countries. Before historians was put the task to consider the policy of Russia exclusively as colonial, and Russia's advance in the East was represented as the expansion and establishment of colonial dictates[16].

A distinctive feature of the historiography of 1920-1930 was scant factual basis, since the researchers were limited in access to the

[15] Materialy dlya geografii i statistiki Rossii, sobrannye oficerami general'nogo shtaba. T. 10: Kirgizkaya step' Orenburgskogo vedomstva / Sostavil general'nogo shtaba podpolkovnik L. Mejer. – Spb. 1865. – S. 2.

[16] Brezhneva S. Prisoedinenie Turkestana k Rossii: diskussionnye problemy dorevolyucionnoj i sovetskoj istoriografii. – Tol'yatti, 2004. – S. 150-155.

archives. The work was not only one-sided in their content, but also small in volume.

In accordance with this concept were written works on the history of Kazakhstan[17], including the first generalizing work by S.Asfendiyarov, in which Russian policy was evaluated as aggressive and colonial[18].

Since the late 1930's, began criticism of the so-called M.N. Pokrovsky School and the concept of absolute evil. In the «Resolution of the Government Commission jur» in August 22, 1937 was expressed discord to this formulation, and began working out the concept of «the lesser evil». It meant that for the nations joining Russia is the lesser evil, compared with dependence on other powers. Great influence on the development of the social sciences had a Decision of the Central Committee of the CPSU (b) and SNK USSR of 27 January 1936 and 14 November 1938 on the state of historical science. Since then, in the country began an active process of bringing historical knowledge in accordance with the «Short Course of the CPSU (b)». Historians were aimed to develop history of individual peoples of the USSR, with an emphasis on the leading role of the Russian people and the Russian proletariat. During this period, despite the ideological pressure on the social sciences, dogmatism and sketchiness of the proposed research models in Kazakhstan historiography appeared fundamental works by M.P. Vyatkin, which have not lost their importance at the present time. The concept of Kazakhstan's accession to Russia was developed in accordance with the «the lesser evil» formula. The author did not agree with the views of the voluntary nature of citizenship, as well as the opposite view – that the accession was the result of the conquest. M. Vyatkin considered the accession process as a union of the local nobility with the tsarist government, against the will of the masses.

Although M. Vyatkin's subject of study was political situation in Kazakhstan on the eve of accession to Russia, which he described as

[17] Ryazanov A.F. 40 let bor'by za nacional'nuyu nezavisimost' kazahskogo naroda. – Ch.1: Vosstanie sultana Karataya Nuralieva (1797-1826). – Kyzyl-Orda, 1926; Bajmurzin A. Iz istorii zahvata carizmom Bol'shoj i Srednej Ord. – Alma-Ata, 1940.

[18] Asfendiyarov S. Istoriya Kazahstana (s drevnejshih vremen). – T.1. – Almaty, 1935. – S. 174-175.

the decline of the Khan's power and foreign policy crisis, the author raised the problem of Russian policy in the first decade after joining. Of paramount importance was the lack of an unambiguous assessment of Russian policy (conquest or «civilizing mission»). M. Vyatkin showed on a broad source base that not having achieved success by force, the Russian administration was focusing on an alliance with the Kazakh ruling nobility. He believed that it was the only way to strengthen the political influence of the tsarist administration in the Kazakh steppe[19].

In the work devoted to the uprising of the Kazakhs under the leadership of Srym Datov M.Vyatkin gave a description of the Orenburg administration activities. Of great importance was the definition by the author of two lines in the local administration policy. Some governors adhered to the policy of the offensive on the steppe through the construction of the fortified lines organization of armed detachments against the Kazakhs. Others – believed that greater success would be brought by the policy of «peaceful conquest of the steppe», by establishing an alliance with the Kazakh nobility.

A great place in M.Vyatkin's works took an analysis of O. Igelstrom's reforms, which he estimated as an attempt to bring governing over the Kazakhs on the type of «Department in 1775». M. Vyatkin came to the conclusion on the futility of the reforms[20].

Of very interest is M.Vyatkin's research focus – influence of the tsarist colonial policy on the fates of the Kazakh Khanate. The author concluded that the main objective in strengthening the tsarist colonial rule in Kazakhstan was the support of various groups of the nobility, «maintaining the balance of forces the policy».

Another important finding was of M. Vyatkin's position that Russian policy during the political crisis in the Kazakh Khanate was a policy of supporting the state collapse, anarchy, i.e weakening. As a result of this policy, Russia was able to deploy a large-scale offensive on the Kazakh steppes.

---

[19] Vyatkin M.P. Politicheskij krizis i hozyajstvennyj upadok v Maloj Orde v konce XVIII – nachale XIX vv. // Materialy po istorii Kazahskoj SSR. T. 4: (1785 – 1828 gg.) / Pod red. M. Vyatkina. – M., L., 1940. – S. 4-5.

[20] Vyatkin M.P. Batyr Srym. – M.,L., 1947. – S. 229, 245, 246, 257.

M. Vyatkin's great merit is the identification and publication of documents collections from archives in Moscow and Leningrad. The high level of archeographic training allowed the specified collections to have a high scientific value in our time. Thus, in spite of the ideological dominance, complicated situation in the 1930 s. M. Vyatkin could create a fundamental works on the basis of a wide range of sources, put and solved a number of problems concerning the Russian policy towards the Kazakhs. M. Vyatkin's works have not lost their scientific value even today. On the further development of the historical science influenced publication in 1941 Stalin's article, devoted to Engels' work «Foreign policy of tsarism». Since that time began rethinking the conceptual foundations of joining various regions and peoples to Russia and, accordingly, changing the assessment of Russian policy in the national borderlands.

Resolutions of the Meeting of historians in 1944 in the course of discussing «History of the Kazakh SSR» 1943, edited by M. Abdykalykov and A. Pankratova on necessity of disclosing the historical roots between the friendship of the Russian and Kazakh peoples, elaborations of the thesis on the progressive effects of accession became the starting point of researches for many years. In the historical science, of the late 1940s was observed a gradual transition process from the concept of «the lesser evil» to the concept of «historical conditionality of accession» of the peoples to Russia, substantiation the voluntary nature of accession and progressive consequences of this process[21].

The most striking phenomenon in the historiography of the period was the work of the famous Kazakh historian E. Bekmakhanov[22]. The work was written at the junction of the two concepts – «the lesser evil» and «historically conditioned». But his assessment of K. Kasymov's movement as a national liberation movement of the Kazakhs caused a negative reaction from the authorities. In 1952 the historian, was deprived of academic titles and sentenced to 25 years.

---

[21] Matvievskij P.E. Abulhair – pobornik edineniya kazahskogo naroda s russkim // Uchenye zapiski Chkalovskogo pedinstituta im. V. P. Chkalova: Seriya istorii i pedagogiki. – Vyp. 1. – Chkalov, 1949. – S. 66-111.

[22] Bekmahanov E. Kazahstan v 20-40-e gody XIX veka. – Alma-Ata, 1948.

Among the works written from the perspective of historical conditionality of accession of Kazakhstan to Russia, the emphasis should be placed on the work of the Moscow scholar N. Apollova[23], which has not lost its scientific value, by now. Written on a variety of archival materials, the monograph provides a holistic view of the premises of establishing Russian-Kazakh relations. It describes the history of the first Russian embassy that had achieved in difficult conditions taking the oath of Mladshiy Zhuz Kazakhs. Of great importance is the historical background of the rendering – the foreign policy situation around the Mladshiy Zhuz Kazakhs.

The undoubted merit of N.G. Apollova was a description of differentiation of social interests of the Kazakh society elite, for which because of various reasons the Russian orientation was not profitable. The analysis of the political system of the Kazakhs, the position of the Khan's power for the Kazakhs have not lost their scientific character till now. The most valuable aspect of the work was putting into a scientific circulation various archival sources, their source analysis. For the first time in the work were summed up the historiographical results of working out problems of the Russian-Kazakh relations.

With the novelty of the problem was also differed the work of Mikhail Rozhkov, written during this period[24]. The author developing a problem on the causes of Russia's offensive to the Sredniy East countries, under which were meant the following regions: the Caucasus, Iran, Kazakhstan, the Khanate of Central Asia and Western China came to the conclusion that economic motives were not the main cause of the aggressive policy of tsarism.

In the historical literature of 1950s began approving the concept of progressivity of joining the peoples to Russia. On the development of historical science in these years influenced the debate (which started with the letter of M. Nechkina to the editor) in the journal «Questions of history». In the course of discussion was raised a

[23] Apollova N. G. Prisoedinenie Kazahstana k Rossii v 30-h godah XVIII veka. – Alma-Ata, 1948.

[24] Rozhkova M. K. EHkonomicheskaya politika carskogo pravitel'stva na Srednem Vostoke vo vtoroj chetverti XIX v. i russkaya burzhuaziya. – M., L., 1949.

number of questions important in the theoretical and concrete-historical terms that had a huge impact on the further researches [25].

M.V. Nechkina raised the question on the legality of using the term «absolute evil» for description of Russia's policy in the national borderlines. She considered that the concept «evil», which meant to the colonial policy of tsarism, did not cover the substance of all the facts that made up the life of the peoples after joining. M.V. Nechkina called historians to the differentiate approach, of using this term and suggested her scheme of rendering peoples history – «unity and struggle of working people of different nations under the leadership of the elder brother – the Russian people»[26].

In the works of 1950s was put the problem of the necessity for a differential approach to the history of the accession of the peoples into the structure of Russia. According to the authors, it should be distinguished regions that were included in the result of the conquest, and also the regions that joined voluntarily. A distinctive feature of this view was the consensus in the assessment of the consequences of the nations joining as a purely positive phenomenon, even under forcible ways of the conquest. Authors saw causes of the Russian offensive in the colonial aspirations of Russian capitalism, that had looked for a new commodity markets[27].

In the monographic study of the famous Kazakh historian E. Bekmakhanov the problem of inclusion of Kazakhstan in the structure of Russian Empire was worked out deeply and in details[28]. The author approached differentiatedly to the tsarist policy and the intercourse of working masses and on this basis concluded that the progressive consequences of the accession formed in spite of the colonial policy of tsarism.

Kazakhstan historiography in the 1960s enriched with several studies in which within the «progressive significance of joining

---

[25] Nechkina M.V. K voprosu o formule «naimen'shee zlo». Pis'mo v redakciyu // Voprosy istorii. – 1951. – № 4; Mustafaev M.O. O formule «naimen'shee zlo» // Voprosy istorii. – 1951. – № 9; Yakunin A.O. O primenenii ponyatiya «naimen'shee zlo» v ocenke prisoedineniya k Rossii nerusskih narodnostej // Voprosy istorii. – 1951. – № 6. – № 11.

[26] Nechkina M. V. K voprosu o formule «naimen'shee zlo». Pis'mo v redakciyu // Voprosy istorii . – 1951. – № 4.

[27] Braginskij I. S., Radzhapov S., Romodin V. A. K voprosu o znachenii prisoedineniya Srednej Azii k Rossii // Voprosy istorii. – 1953. – № 8.

[28] Бекмаханов Е. Присоединение Казахстана к России. – М., 1957.

Russia» concept got further deepening themes of Russian-Kazakh relations.

By the end of the 1970s and still retained the basic conceptual provisions of the preceding period. At the same time, there began writing a lot about the great community of the Soviet people, which led to the consolidation in the historical literature another concept: «the great friendship of peoples» and their joint revolutionary struggle led by his older brother – «the great Russian people».

The concept of «voluntary accession and its progressive values» reached its apogee in the 1980 th. For works of this period was characteristic hiding negative aspects of the colonial policy and developing the formula of progressive consequences of the accession, expressed in friendship with the Russian proletariat. In the Kazakh historiography were published a series of works dedicated to the 250th anniversary of the annexation to Russia[29]. Summing up the considered stage of the Soviet historiography (1920-1970), it can be said that the central place in the study of the Russian policy in the national borderlines occupied the problem of joining the peoples to Russia. It was studied and evolved in the context of two major conceptual constructs: the theory of colonization or conquest and the concept of peaceful, voluntary accession. At the heart of the transformation of the given points of view were political and social causes.

The Russian Empire policy was studied in the framework of these concepts as purely aggressive, aimed at the establishment of colonial rule. During the dominance of the voluntary association concept the Russian policy had been studied differentiatedly: the tsarist policy «as a prison of peoples» and peaceful contacts of orking strata.

[29] Problema russko-kazahskih vzaimosvyazej v XVIII – nachale XIX vv. – Alma-Ata, 1980; Social'no-ehkonomicheskie i istoricheskie predposylki i progressivnoe znachenie prisoedineniya Kazahstana k Rossii: Mezhvuzovskij sbornik. – Alma-Ata, 1981; Sulejmenov B.S., Basin V. YA. Kazahstan v sostave Rossii v XVI – nachale XX vv. – Alma-Ata, 1981; Svetloj dorogoj druzhby i bratstva: Sbornik materialov o prazdnovanii 250-letiya dobrovol'nogo prisoedineniya Kazahstana k Rossii. – Alma-Ata, 1982; Naveki vmeste, k 250-letiyu dobrovol'nogo prisoedineniya Kazahstana k Rossii. Alma-Ata, 1982;SHoinbaev T. Zh. Dobrovol'noe vhozhdenie kazahskih zemel' v sostav Rossii. – 2-e izd., pererab., dop. – Alma-Ata, 1982; Kasymbaev ZH. K. Pod nadezhnuyu zashchitu Rossii. – Alma-Ata, 1986.

The merit of the Soviet period historians was the expansion of perspective studies, the introduction into circulation a wide range of different sources, purposeful work on their publication. Researchers did a lot of work on accumulating the factual base of studying the relationship of the peoples in the Russian state. Refusing to outdated dogmas, stereotypes and one-sided assessments was important to keep all the value that had been accumulated during this period.

However, it should be noted that the dominance of the Marxist-Leninist methodology, ideological tasks, dependence on the political situation led to the fact that a large number of works were characterized by one-sided, the class approach to the problem «of Russia's policy in the national borderlands». The thesis of the voluntary accession of more backward peoples to Russia, which was considered to be a positive aspect, obscured the complexity and contradictions of multinational Russia formation, excessively modernized the level of inter-ethnic cooperation in the era of the modern time. The political engagedness of the problem led to shifting emphasis in researching towards studying the consequences of joining Russia, rather than the process itself.

In addition economic determinism that prevailed in historical science, did not allow to fully showing the depth of socio-cultural changes. The transformation of traditional societies as a result of interaction with Russia was one-sidedly considered from the standpoint of the formation approach to the well-known formula. «Bypassing capitalism to socialism». The conclusion «all positive happened in spite of the tsarist policy» not only greatly impoverished the multifactorial process of transformation of traditional societies in the imperial period of the development, but also obscured the depth of changes in Russia itself. The conceptual apparatus of researches was also limited: «voluntary accession», «historical roots of Friendship of Peoples», «the emergence of capitalist relations», «colonial policy».

As for contemporary stage it can be noted the western scholarship had done a lot on studying the Empires' problem. It is characteristic for them to develop theoretical basis to the analysis of empires, to give them a scientific definition. Of great importance is the definition of metropolitan by prof. Robert Suny, an expert on the

theory of imperial statehood and typology of imperial control. According to him, the metropolis are the institute of political domination, and the relationship between the metropolitan and the periphery could be described as center-periphery relations, but not on ethnic grounds. He believed that in the Russian Empire, ruling institutions were not characterized by ethnically or geographically, but a special political status, were identified with one or another class.

Consequently, in this regard, neither the Russian Empire nor the Soviet Union were ethnically «Russian Empire» (carriers of the metropolitan functions in Russia was the imperial family with the landlord nobility and the bureaucracy), – wrote R. Suny. The place of the dominant nationality occupied the dominance institution – the nobility, which although was dominated by Russians, was multinational[30].

J. Hosking separates the issue of the formation of the Russian nation from the issue of the empire formation, and proves that the empire building processes hampered the Russian national project in Russia[31].

In recent years, foreign researchers have focused on studying not only the causes of the fall of empires, but also on their resistance mechanisms [32]. In the most recent publications, as well as on the pages of coordinating this perspective scholarly journal "Ab Imperio» (Kazan), and also on a specialized website, have been reflected the problems of long-term existence of the Russian Empire, the theory of the core and the periphery of empires relationships, the ratio of national and regional traditions and unifying trends[33].

A productive exchange of views between the Western (where was formed a new school – «a new history of empires») and Russian

---

[30] Suny R. Imperiya kak ona est': imperskaya Rossiya, «nacional'noe» samosoznanie i teoriya imperii // Av Imperio. – Kazan', 2001. – № 1-2. – S. 15.

[31] Geoffrey Hosking. Rossiya: narod i imperiya (1552-1917). – Smolensk, 2000.

[32] Rieber A. Approaches to empire // Ot mira imperii k globalizacii. – Saratov, 2002. – S. 117-138.

[33] Rossijskaya imperiya v sravnitel'noj perspektive. – M., 2004; Novaya imperskaya istoriya postsovestkogo prostranstva. – Kazan', 2004; Rossijskaya imperiya v zarubezhnoj istoriografii. – M., 2005.

scientists stimulated a number of studies in studying of Russian history as an empire. Among the researchers involved in the imperial issues, is observed conceptual marking out three historiographical trends. Despite the significant differences in the interpretation of the «empire» concept content, they are united by a common desire to overcome traditions as a state-centric as nation-centric historiography. The first direction is devoted to the study of the participation of the Russian Empire in international politics, which was an essential factor in determining the state territory. The concept «empire» is used as a synonym for «great power». The main focus of these studies was done on the relationship between the context of international relations and domestic policy of the empire, the consequences of international competition and expansion in the internal life of the empire, the consequences of inter-imperial competition for the borderlands and boundaries [34].

It should be noted that this direction is traditional for the Russian historiography. So, N.S. Kinyapina in 1980-1990s worked in this direction. In her works the problems of joining Central Asia to the Russian Empire were considered in the general context of the internal and external policies of the government. They show the military-strategic value of the territory and the role of local features in the accession process. N.S. Kinyapina's approach to consider the region accession process through the geopolitical factor, taking into account the role of local peculiarities is seemed to be valuable.

Professor E.N. Dick (Mexico City) in his problematic article considers the foreign policy of Russia as an empire building process. He believes that the geopolitical situation of the country, «filled its foreign course with expansionist- defensive content[35]».

Researchers of the second direction concern the empire as a special political entity, characterized by dynastic political regime, a composite internal structure, heterogeneous government system. The

[34] Kinyapina N.S., Bliev M.M., Degoev V.V. Kavkaz i Srednyaya Aziya vo vneshnej politike Rossii. – M., 1984; Oreshekova S.F., Ul'chenko N.Yu. Rossiya i Turciya (problema formirovaniya granic). – M., 1999.

[35] Dik E. N. Vneshnepoliticheskie faktory Rossijskogo imperskogo stroitel'stva // Rossiya v XVIII-XX vv.: Stranicy istorii. K 50-letiyu nauchnoj i pedagogicheskoj deyatel'nosti v Moskovskom universitete zasluzhennogo professora N.S. Kinyapinoj. – M., 2000. – S. 248-253.

development of this direction is associated with another meaning of the term Empire, namely the vast territory. Therefore, an important place among the researches occupy regional studies in which the authors propose to consider the empire as a system of relations between the center and the regions in which the flexibility and variability of government policy were the key to the stability of the empire.

Based on the definition of the empire – as a special political organism, scientists have developed a variety of aspects of the imperial problems: history of the imperial elites and administrative governing with borderlands[36]. As it was already mentioned, within these historiographical directions regional studies researches occupy a special place.

The third direction in the historiography of the Russian Empire history describes the empire as a multinational state, in other words, as a society, composed of different ethnic groups with their own historical, cultural, religious and linguistic traditions[37].

Finally, analysis of the recent literature on the subject is impossible without an analysis of the conceptual apparatus of researchers and, above all, the concept of "Empire". Earlier in the literature, the term «Empire» in the characterization of Russia's policy towards the non-Russian peoples was used depending on the political conjuncture. You can agree with Dominic Lieven, professor at the London School of Economics, that the term «Empire» is polysemantic, very informative and a vague term, full of ideological traps. He asserts that the term «Empire» has many meanings Empire

[36] Pavlenko N.I. Petr Velikij. – M., 1990; Vodarskij A.E. Petr I // Voprosy istorii. – 1993. – № 6. Sorokin YU. A.K voprosu o politicheskom haraktere Ekateriny II v 1762-1768 // Istoricheskij ezhegodnik. – 1998. – Omsk, 1999. – S. 5-13; Stegnij P.V. Hroniki vremen Ekateriny II, 1729-1796. – M., 2001; Migunova T.L. Administrativnye reformy Ekateriny Velikoj (istoricheskie predposylki i rezul'taty). – Nizhnij Novgorod, 2001.

[37] Kappeler A. Dve tradicii v otnoshenii Rossii k musul'manskim narodam Rossijskoj imperii // Otechestvennaya istoriya. – 2003. – № 2. – S.129-135; Polunov A. YU. O religii i imperii: missiya, obrashcheniya, veroterpimost' v carskoj Rossii // Tam zhe. – № 5. – S. 197-202; Lur'e S. V. Rossijskaya imperiya kak ehtnokul'turnyj fenomen i ehtnopoliticheskaya real'nost' Zakavkaz'ya // Lur'e S.V. metamorfozy tradicionnogo soznaniya. – Spb., 1994; Gatagova L. S. Pravitel'stvennaya politika i narodnoe obrazovanie na Kavkaze v XIX v. – M., 1993.

and moreover in different years it was put in in different – positive or negative sense[38].

For instance in the literature to the end of the 1980s of the XX century the term «Empire» was used in three senses. During the «Cold War» it was used concerning the external relations of the USSR with the «eastern satellites» (within the meaning of the USSR – a great power). The second meaning of the term stressed unequal, dependent relationship, relations of domination and subordination between the center = metropolis and national republics = colonies.

This meaning was typical of conservatives and «anti-Soviet» propagandists in their interpretation of Soviet national policy, in the analysis of the internal relations between Moscow and the non-Russian peoples. The third meaning of the term was used by Ronald Reagan in the sense that «The Soviet Union was the Empire of evil», as a description of the state, which was considered to be repressive at home and expansionist in its foreign policy.

Thus, in the period of «the cold war» the term had a significant ideological load; so many serious researchers often ignored the imperial component in their studies. In the late 1980s with the growth of separatism and nationalism within the Soviet Union, the term began being used in a broader sense as a category describing a certain form of a multi-ethnic state[39].

In the Soviet historical literature, the term «Empire», as rightly pointed out S. Kaspe was «more peripheral». Analysis of the literature shows that it was characterized by a simple identification of the official name of the state and its inner essence. For example, in Encyclopedia of 1926-1927 the definition of the term went back to the classical period, so it was defined that «empire is the state, led by the Emperor», in the Encyclopedia of 1931 «Empire» was defined as a title, which enjoyed great monarchical state. In the late 1930 s under «Empire» began taking the political and cultural domination

[38] Lieven D. The Russian empire and its rivals. – L., 2000.

[39] Lieven D. The Russian empire and its rivals. – L., 2000; Suny R. Imperiya kak ona est': imperskaya Rossiya, «nacional'noe» samosoznanie i teoriya imperii // Ab Imperio, 2001. – № 1-2. – S. 9-10; 12-14, 17; Mark Von Hagen. Writing the History of Russia as Empire: The Perspective of Federalism // Kazan', Moskva, Peterburg: Rossijskaya imperiya vzglyadom iz raznyh uglov. – M., 1997. – S. 393-409.

and economic exploitation of colonies by metropolises[40]. Therefore, the term «Empire» is gradually disappearing from the social and political vocabulary and academic literature as a negative connotation, being present in definitions contradicts prevailing concepts.

As it was already noted, the concept «Empire» in modern literature is used in a new sound. It began being used in a broader sense, as a category that describes a certain form of the multinational state. The definitions «Empire» existing now can be grouped into four: the first – identical to the concept «a great power».

The second meaning is indicated in the studies in which the empire is taken as a special political entity, characterized by dynastic political regime, a composite internal structure, heterogeneous government system and special relationship between state and society. The third meaning of the term «Empire» existing in Russian historiography, can be defined as a multinational state, as a society, composed of different ethnic groups with their own historical, cultural and religious traditions. The fourth definition was introduced by S. Kaspe. It is based on an attempt to unify the definitions existing in the historical political science and historical science - the empire as structures and ideas with «syndromic» (coming from group of certain features) and «genetic» (description of empires origin, mechanisms supporting their existence) definitions. Historiographic analysis of the problem «policy of Russian Empire toward the non-Russian peoples of the borderlands» given in chapter allows to summarize and outline the lesser known aspects of it. Of great importance was the recognition of researchers a multiethnic, multinational character as the defining feature of the Russian state. It allowed the researchers to focus on studying certain regions of the empire. As a result, as a promising research direction became not the national state approach but the regional one. The literature analysis showed that the conversion of national borderlands into the regions of Russia is represented as a political but not a social process. More attention is paid to the history of military actions, diplomatic

[40] Novejshij ehnciklopedicheskij slovar'. – M., 1926-1927: Izdatel'stva P.P. Sojkina; MSEH. – T.3. – M., 1931; BSEH – Izd.1-e. – T. 28. – M., 1937.

relations, government questions. «Structural aspects of Russian expansion» (Kappeler's term) have been studied from an economic determinism standpoint or purely from the point of view of the formation approach (expressed as a «bypassing capitalism to socialism» formula). Outside research search there are problems of social and cultural changes in the shape of transformed societies. Changes in traditional societies consisted not only in changing forms of management (it was often represented as forcible settling nomads), the civilizational vector, but also in the transformation of socio-cultural image of society, value directions, norms of behavior. This approach will allow better understanding formation of the imperial political space and allow concluding that the model of civilization culture and value system imposed by Russia, eventually cemented it (imperial space). Long existence of the Russian empire, was not only the result of military force, but also the adoption of the cultural values of the empire by the peoples. Studying of political and psychological factors in the Russian local administrations is not paid enough attention.

5.2. The process of Kazakh Zhuses integration to Russian Empire, 1731-1865

This section of the textbook was written on the base of I.V. Erofeeva's essay[41]. One can agree with her thesis that the process of accession of the Kazakh zhuzes to Russia was long in time and very complicated in its content. I. Yerofeyeva the process of involving the Kazakh zhuzes into the structure of empire divides into four main chronological periods. However, she proceeds from the degree of penetration of the Russian Empire in the social space of Kazakhstan.**I. Yerofeyeva outlines the first period with 1730-1740 of the XVIII century[42].** She calls it the era of spread of the formal-

[41] Erofeeva I.V. Казахское ханство и власть в традиционном обществе казахов // Masanov N.E., Abylhozhin Zh.B., Erofeeva I.V. i dr. Istoriya Kazahstana: narodyi kul'tury: Ucheb. posobie. – Almaty: Dajk-Press, 2001. – P. 113-191.

[42] Erofeeva I.V. Казахское ханство и власть в традиционном обществе казахов // Masanov N.E., Abylhozhin ZH.B., Erofeeva I.V. idr. Istoriya Kazahstana: narodyi kul'tury: ucheb. posobie. – Almaty: Dajk-Press, 2001. – P. 169-170.

legal suzerainty of the Russian Empire on the Kazakh population of the Mladshiy and the part of Sredniyzhuzes. At this stage, the oath of allegiance to the Russian throne in turn swore the Kazakh khans and influential sultans of the Mladshiy and of Sredniyzhuzes during Russian-Kazakh negotiations. At this stage, took place the official adoption of the Russian citizenship by the Kazakh rulers of the Mladshiy and Sredniyzhuzes, appeared individual contacts of the Russian Border Administration with Kazakh elite. During this period there were not any significant transformations of Russian-Kazakh relations. Nevertheless, the Russian Empire strengthened its positions in the northern and north-eastern borders of Kazakhstan. This happened through the construction of new cities (Orsk was built in 1733, Orenburg in 1743) and new fortified lines: Orenburg, New Ishim, Kolyvano-Voskresenskoy.

The second period of 1750th – the beginning of the XIX century according to I. Erofeeva[43] is characterized by the desire to establish Russian control over the activities of the Kazakh khans. At first, Russia was seeking that the Kazakh khans could get the status of legitimacy only after official confirmation of their Khan title by the Russian emperor. Then, Russia was trying to establish a system of direct regulation, both the sphere of the foreign policy of the Kazakh khans and the interior affairs. However, after the elimination of the Dzhungar Khanate and emergence of a stronger competitor in the rivalry for spheres of influence in Central Asia, the Russian Government adheres to an offensive policy in Central Asia.To this end, in 1767-1771 Russia starts building new fortified line (Kolyvan-Kuznetsk) on the right bank of the Upper Irtysh. At the same time Russia began to rebuild and strengthen previously constructed fortresses and outposts on the Irtysh line. By the Sredniy of the XVIII century the Russian Empire started implementation of the course Elimination of Khan's power in Kazakhstan. But Russia began this process very carefully. The strategy was the policy of discrediting in the Kazakh society institutions of Khan Power in order to pave the way for its complete and final cancellation. To

[43] Erofeeva I.V. Казахское ханство и власть в традиционном обществе казахов // Masanov N.E., Abylhozhin Zh.B., Erofeeva I.V. i dr. Istoriya Kazahstana: narodyi kul'tury: ucheb. posobie. – Almaty: Dajk-Press, 2001. – P. 172-175.

achieve this goal, Russia advanced gradually. At first achieved the procedure of approval of the Kazakh khans (Ablai-khan in 1771-1780, Wali-khan in 1781-1821, Bukey-khan in 1816-1819, and then their direct assignment (from 1791 all khans of the Mladshiyzhuz were appointed by the Russian Government). Then Russia began initiating home political struggle for power and artificially multiplies the number of khans. Then the Russian government put on the Khan's throne insufficiently authoritative and incapable sultans (e.g. the elderly Yeraly, 1791-1794, or Aychuvak, 1797-1805) and deliberately ignored the most powerful and competent contenders for the Khan throne, and even removed from power unnecessarily independent and potentially independent khans. As a result of this purposeful policy at the end of the second decade of the XIX century in Kazakhstan were created conditions for the Elimination of the Institute of the khan's power.

The third period in advancing the Russian Empire I. Yerofeyeva outlines the 1820-1850s[44]. At this stage were implementing profound reforms of the power institutions in Kazakhstan. Kazakhstan started being included in the administrative-territorial administration of the Russian Empire. So, in 1822 by Emperor Alexander I decree, Khan Power in the Mladshiyzhuz was eliminated. In 1824, Khan Authority was abolished in the Mladshiyzhuz, and in 1845 – in the Sredniyzhuz or Bukey Horde.

To control the territories included in the jurisdiction of Russia were taken a number of legislative acts: in 1822 – the «Regulations on the Siberian Kyrgyzs»; in 1838 – «Regulations on separate governing of the Siberian Kirghiz»; in 1854 – «Regulations on governing the Semipalatinsk region». During this period in the fight against the Kokand Khanate Russia conquered it and North-West Semirechye. For governing the newly conquered territories were adopted the following legislative acts: in the 1855-1856 «Instruction on governing the Syr Darya Kyrgyz» in 1861; «The Regulations on the military structure of the Kirghiz steppes of the Orenburg

[44] Erofeeva I.V. Казахское ханство и власть в традиционном обществе казахов // Masanov N.E., Abylhozhin Zh.B., Erofeeva I.V. idr. Istoriya Kazahstana: narodyi kul'tury: ucheb. posobie. – Almaty: Dajk-Press, 2001. – P. 175-183.

department and the Syr Darya line»; and in 1862 – «Regulations on the Alatavsk district administration». Based on this legislative acts in 1820-1850s was organized a new control system.On the territory of Kazakhstan, which in this period was included into the Russian Empire, was introduced a system of taxation. The Siberian department Kazakhs in 1830-1860 s paid yasak tribute – a natural progressive tax, which amounted to one head of livestock with cattle. For the Orenburg department Kazakhs was introduced a kibitka tribute in the form of a money fixed tax when from each kibitka annually were levied 1.5 silver ruble. With the Inner Horde Kazakhs was levied a tax- zyaket and sogum, which was taken in the form of money, and since 1860 – the tax tribute.

In addition to these taxes, which were levied once a year, at the same time, the Kazakh population carried in favor of the state a number of other tributes and duties, for instance excise in the Orenburg department and repair duties in the Siberian department, ticketing fees, postage and underwater services. Thus, at the third stage of Russia's advance deep into the Kazakh steppe there was established jurisdiction and the right of the Russian Empire land ownership in the western, northern, central and eastern regions of Kazakhstan.

During this period the Russian border delineated the Syr Darya region and Semirechye. In order to delineate the boundaries was built a chain of fortified lines in the valleys of the Torgay and Irgiz rivers, at the mouth of the Syr Darya, were established settlements of Russian Cossacks at the Raim fortification and Fort Karabutak. In the summer of 1853 the Russian military unit under the command of the Orenburg military governor General Perovsky took the Ak-Mechet fortress, on the site of which was erected the Russian Perovsky outpost. At the same time on the part of Siberia in the direction of South Kazakhstan moved and built fortifications the West Siberian Governor GH Gasford. So, in 1845 were built the Kapal fortification, then Sergiopol, Lepsinsk, Vreny. In 1859 the territory of the Mladshiy and of Sredniyzhuzes were transferred from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Internal Affairs. It meant that the main territory of Kazakhstan became a part of the Russian Empire.

The fourth period (1850-1860s)[45] were characterized establishing the Russian empire in the entire geographical space of Kazakhstan, involving of all the Kazakh population groups in the administrative and political system of the Russian Empire. In this period was created a strategic base for capturing the entire South Kazakhstan. For this purpose lines of military fortifications from Perovsk up along the Syr Darya and from Verny in the Semirechye towards the south were closed up in 1864. It was made possible after 1863 when Russian troops conquered the Kokand fortresses as Dzhumagal, Kurka and Suzak in the northern slopes area of the ridge Karatau, and in 1864 – the Aulie-Ata and Chimkent cities.

Thus, as a result of the military conquest the southern lands of Kazakhstan were finally annexed to Russia. To govern the newly conquered lands was formed Turkestan general governorship, which consisted of two areas – Semirechensk and Syrdarya. Thus, the entire territory of Kazakhstan became a part of the Russian Empire. Therefore, all the former control system over the Kazakh lands was abolished and developed a united system of administration. At the same time on the territory of Kazakhstan was introduced a unified system of the taxation – kibitz tribute, in the form of the fixed tax, annually levied with each kibitka in cash.

At first, the tax rate was not higher than 2.5 rubles, and then rose to 3 rubles, and after the reforms of 1886-1891 was 4.5 ruble. Besides the Kazakhs paid such taxes as the ticket ones, excise for moving cattle on the line, the repair duties, as well as postal and performed underwater services.

Some of them in the second half of the XIX century were transformed into a land tax. Thus, the process of accession of Kazakhstan to the Russian Empire, which began in 1731 was completed in 1765-1766, when South Kazakhstan was conquered. From that time until 1917 Kazakhstan was a part of the Russian Empire. However, it makes no differences how academicians treat this period today – as a colonial with a focus on the loss of independence or in the spirit that Russia fulfilled a civilizing mission

[45] Erofeeva I.V. Kazahskoe hanstvo i vlast' v tradicionnom obshchestve kazahov // Masanov N.E., Abylhozhin Zh.B., Erofeeva I.V. i dr. Istoriya Kazahstana: narodyi kul'tury: Ucheb. posobie. – Almaty: Dajk-Press, 2001. – P. 184-187.

towards the backward borderland, we can not deny that it was a qualitatively new stage in the history of Kazakhstan. It was the stage when was going Russian intervention in all aspects of life of the Kazakhs: the social structure was broken down, was forcibly alienated most fertile grazing lands, and was formed an entirely new governing system, was imposed Russian culture. But at the same time it was the period of the emerging of industry, construction of railways, the emergence of cities, printing, education, and most importantly the growth of national consciousness, the spread of new ideas, the appearance a layer of intellectuals who could articulate ideas of independence and the Kazakh people rights. Most importantly – we must not forget that, in spite of everything, the Kazakh people remained as an ethnic group, did not lose control over the territory that later made it possible to create here an independent, sovereign state.

Control questions:

1. Show the essence of the Russia's civilizing mission concept. For all of that give names of the authors and show the concept evolution with the time.
2. Show main meanings of the term Empire in the present time.
3. Enumerate all the gradual measures with which Russia abolished the Khan power in Kazakhstan.
4. What taxes did the Kazakhs pay in the Russian treasury in the second half of the XIX century?
5. What were main results of the Russian administration activities at the second stage of the conditional scheme of advancing Russia deep into the Kazakh steppe in second half of the XVIII – the beginning of the XIX century.

VI Part

KAZAKHSTAN IN THE STRUCTURE OF THE SOVIET UNION, 1917-1991

6.1. Kazakhstan in the pre-war time, 1917-1939

6.1.1. Building the Soviet model of the Nation and State structure in Kazakhstan

Before talking about practical implementation of the Soviet model of the Nation and State in Kazakhstan it is necessary to make a small review of modern concepts on the Soviet national policy in foreign historiography. Additionally, to show what projects on the state structure of Kazakhstan were proposed by the Kazakh national intelligentsia? For years Western historians evaluated the Soviet epoch for the non-Russians as a period of unceasing national oppression, imperial domination and / or Russification.

In recent decades, have appeared were works that represent a more complex and far from to be unambiguous assessment of the Soviet national policy nature. So, Terry Martin[46] in his comprehensive analysis of the national question of the first two

[46] Terry Martin is the George F. Baker III Professor of Russian Studies in the History Department at Harvard University. He is the author of The Affirmative Action Empire: Nations and Nationalism in the USSR, 1923-1939 (Cornell UP, 2001) and co-editor (with Ronald Suny) of A State of Nations: Empire and Nation-Making in the Age of Lenin and Stalin (Oxford UP, 2001). In addition to questions of nationality and empire, he has written on religion, political and administrative history, Soviet neo-traditionalism, and the political police, as well as the Nazi-Soviet comparison. He is currently completing a book on the politics and sociology of state information-gathering in the USSR from the revolution through the death of Stalin.

decades of the Soviet state uses the concept of «The Affirmative Action Empire». In his understanding the term «affirmative action» is not just promote local Bolshevik communist cadres and national languages. For him, «affirmative action» means much more than a series of concessions to national feelings or rejection of the repressive methods of the old imperial state. Martin believed that «affirmative action» – was, first of all, the assignment of the forms of statehood to non-Russian peoples. However, he stressed that Lenin and Stalin's intention was to split national unity of non-Russian peoples. He wrote that Lenin and Stalin believed that the transcending class distinctions call to nationalism could be disarmed by providing them with forms of statehood. In the annotation to the book is pointed out: «The Soviet Union was the first of Europe's multiethnic states to confront the rising tide of nationalism by systematically promoting the national consciousness of its ethnic minorities and establishing for them many of the institutional forms characteristic of the modern nation-state. In the 1920s, the Bolshevik government, seeking to defuse nationalist sentiment, created tens of thousands of national territories. It trained new national leaders, established national languages, and financed the production of national-language cultural products. This was a massive and fascinating historical experiment in governing a multiethnic state. Terry Martin provides a comprehensive survey and interpretation, based on newly available archival sources, of the Soviet management of the nationalities question. He traces the conflicts and tensions created by the geographic definition of national territories, the establishment of dozens of official national languages, and the world's first mass «affirmative action» programs. Martin examines the contradictions inherent in the Soviet nationality policy, which sought simultaneously to foster the growth of national consciousness among its minority populations while dictating the exact content of their cultures; to sponsor national liberation movements in neighboring countries, while eliminating all foreign influence on the Soviet Union's many diaspora nationalities. Martin explores the political logic of Stalin's policies as he responded to a perceived threat to Soviet unity in the 1930 s by re-establishing the Russians as the state's leading nationality and deporting numerous «enemy

nations»[47]. Yuri Slezkine's[48] argument of the Soviet Union as a «communal apartment» created by «philo-nationalists» in which nations were created for their own sake. It should be noted that in Western historiography old interpretation concepts of the Soviet national policy also continue existing. So, Francine Hirsch[49] understands the process of of Soviet nations formation in the baccordance with the colonial discourse of creating the European colonial powers. She believes that the Soviet nationalities policy was aimed at quickly directing each nation through historical stages defined by Karl Marx (from feudalism to capitalism then through a socialist statehood to communism, when the national status, ultimately, will disappear). Now let consider how the Bolsheviks had put into practice their project of nation and state structure of Kazakhstan? It should be noted that in Kazakhstan in the first years after the establishment of Soviet power there were several national state construction projects. So, the Alash Orda guidance on the Second All-Kazakh Congress in December 1917, announced the formation of the Alash national-territorial autonomy, and the Fourth Regional All-Muslim Congress in November 1917 – the Turkestan (Kokand Autonomy) Territorial Autonomy, which however, in February 1918 was crushed by the Bolsheviks. Leaders of the Alash Orda negotiated with the central Soviet government for recognition of the Alash Autonomy. To this end, Khalel Dosmukhamed and Zhahansha Dosmukhamedov were sent to Moscow for a meeting with the Chairman of the RSFSR SNK V.I. Lenin and the People's Commissar for Nationalities Joseph Stalin. Simultaneously, April 2,

[47] http://www.amazon.com/Affirmative-Action-Empire-Nationalism-1923-1939/dp/0801486777

[48] Terry Martin is the George F. Baker III Professor of Russian Studies in the History Department at Harvard University. He is the author of The Affirmative Action Empire: Nations and Nationalism in the USSR, 1923–1939 (Cornell UP, 2001) and co-editor (with Ronald Suny) of A State of Nations: Empire and Nation-Making in the Age of Lenin and Stalin (Oxford UP, 2001). In addition to questions of nationality and empire, he has written on religion, political and administrative history, Soviet neo-traditionalism, and the political police, as well as the Nazi-Soviet comparison. He is currently completing a book on the politics and sociology of state information-gathering in the USSR from the revolution through the death of Stalin.

[49] **Francine Hirsch** is Associate Professor of History at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. Her interests include Russian and Soviet history, modern European history, and comparative empires. Hirsch is author of Empire of Nations: Ethnographic Knowledge and the Making of the Soviet Union (Cornell University Press, 2005).

1918 Halel Gabassov from Semipalatinsk by direct line was negotiating with Joseph Stalin. During the talks the leaders of the Alash Orda were forced to recognize the «Soviet power as the central government of all autonomous entities in the country». At the same time, the leaders of Alash Orda persistently promoted a number of provisions, which would virtually ensure the independence of the Alash Autonomy. They fought for the territorial integrity of Kazakhstan, for concentrating legislative and executive power in the hands of the Alash Orda's leaders. They also demanded to pass decision of issues to Kazakh district and regional courts, sought to create people's militia as armed forces of the autonomy. Leaders of the Alash Orda requested to provide political immunity for statesmen and the Kazakh intelligentsia being disloyal to the Soviet regime and supporting the Alash Orda. But none of the AlashnOrda's leader's proposals were supported by the Soviet leadership. Zhansha Dosmukhamedov and Khalel Dosmukhamedov negotiations in Moscow with the leaders of the Soviet government showed that the central government was strongly opposed to the Kazakh statehood, based on the principles of national reconciliation and unity, but sought to creating autonomy based on class division of society.

In early 1918the the Ushzhuz's party leaders Kolbay Togus opposed the idea of the Alash Autonomy. At the same time Ushzhuz party did not have a clear position on issues of nation-building. They believed that the cultural and economic backwardness of Kazakhstan, sparseness of its population scattered all over the vast territory (from Astrakhan to China), the multinational character of the region the main obstacles to the formation of the Kazakh statehood. They argued that the Kazakh statehood can not be formed only on the basis of the Kazakh people, as the existence of representatives of other nations on the territory of Kazakhstan, should be a source of insoluble strifes. The Ushzhuz Party saw a form of statehood in the form of the Turkic-Tatar statehood which would unite all Russian Muslims on the basis of Turkic language. But, when in the late spring of 1918 the Bolsheviks started preparatory works on creating Kazakh Soviet statehood, the Ushzhuz party representatives took the Bolsheviks's side. They

are essentially mechanically accepted the idea of Soviet autonomy and supported by the Soviet government in the struggle against the Alash Orda. So, after the establishment of Soviet power on the entire territory of Kazakhstan, except the Ural region, in April-May 1918, the Bolsheviks began implementing their project of creation of the Kazakh autonomy as an integral part of the RSFSR. At the heart of the project lay the class principle, which in the opinion of the Bolsheviks was to obscure national feelings of the Kazakhs. On the way to the Kazakh autonomy creation could be drawn several stages. In the first stage May 12, 1918 was created A Kazakh Department in the Structure of the RSFSR People's Commissariat of Nationalities. The main task of the Department and the Extraordinary Commissioner of the Kirgiz Steppe region A. Zhangildin was preparation and convening of the All-Kazakh Congress of Soviets. But because of the Civil War started i summer of 1918, the creation of the Kazakh Soviet autonomy was stopped. And then with the liberation of the territory of Kazakhstan and rehabilitation of the Soviet authorities, the problems of nation-state building began to rise again. During this period, was established a body of civil-military control over the Ural, Turgay, Akmola, Semipalatinsk regions and a part of the Astrakhan province. It became the Revolutionary Committee on ruling the Kazakh territory (Kazrevkom), which was formed by the decree of the SNK RSFSR from 10 July 1919. Its first memebers were: S. Pestkovsky (chairman), A. Baitursynov, A. Zhangeldin, M. Tunganchin, S. Mendeshev, B. Karataev. At various times, members of Kazrevkom were Aitiev A., S. Argynshiev, A. Avdeev, A. Alibayov, B. Karaldin. The Kazrevkom functioned or fifteen months from July 10, 1919 to October 10, 1920. During this time, it had to solve urgent military and political problems caused by the Civil War. But the main issue for the Kazrevkom members remained of the preparation of the Constituent Congress of Soviets of Kazakhstan, gathering Kazakh lands in the framework of the Soviet statehood. It should be emphasized that the composition of the Kazrevkom was a reflection of the compromise between the Soviet power and the Alash movement. Its members were as active Soviet officials (A. Zhangeldin, S. Mendesev, B. Karataev), as well as prominent figures of the Alash movement, opponents of the

Bolsheviks (A. Alibekov, B.A. Karaldin, A. Baitursynov). At the same time A. Baitursynov was appointed chairman of the Kazrevkom, often replacing him, and B. Karaldin occupied one of the key positions – Secretary of the Kazrevkom. Such a compromise in summer of 1919 was beneficial to both parties. The Soviet power was advantageous because on the way of establishing national autonomies of the Kazakhs, Bashkirs, Tatars and others it transformed a certain part of these nations into allies, thereby weakening the social base of nationalists. On the other hand, the Soviet power by controlling the active members of the national autonomists, made virtually impossible forming a Kazakh-Bashkir autonomy with the center in Orenburg. After realizing unreality of creating Kazakh statehood on the basis of the decision of the Second All-Kazakh Congress, the leaders of the Alash Orda made a compromise with the Soviet authorities. Therefore the leaders of the Alash movement accepted the idea of the formation of the Soviet autonomy of Kazakhstan on the basis of the restoration of its territorial integrity. Despite the difficulties of the joint activity of the people standing on different ideological and political positions, many-sided activities of the Kazrevkom contributed to the speedy ending of the Civil War, preparing and granting amnesty for the participants of the Alash movement, as well as the convening of a Constituent Congress of Soviets of Kazakhstan for the purpose of fromation of the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic. The historical significance of the Kazrevkom activities was in determination of the borders of the future Republic. This mission was entrusted to the Commission on determining the future borders of the Kazakh Republic, organized under the Kazrevkom led by A. Baitursynov. The Commission's activities were carried out under conditions of continuous struggle with great-power chauvinists. Big controversies arose concerning the inclusion in the structure of the future Republic significant regions of the Ural, Semipalatinsk, Akmolinsk and Turgay areas. To resolve issues representatives of the Kazrevkom were sent to Omsk, Chelyabinsk, Semipalatinsk. It should be noted that in the territorial dispute in determining the future borders of the Republic the head of the central Soviet government V.I. Lenin was on the side of the representatives of the Kazakh people, who had

been at the origin of the republic formation. By the end of 1919 the main territory of Kazakhstan had been liberated from the White Guards. In March 1920, was eliminated the Semirechensky front – the last front of the Civil War in Kazakhstan. All that created favorable conditions for completing works on the formation of the Kazakh ASSR. In August 26, 1920, V.I. Lenin and M.I. Kalinin signed the decree «On the Formation of the Autonomous Kirghiz (Kazakh) Soviet Socialist Republic as a part of the RSFSR». Creating the Kazakh autonomy in the form of the Soviet Republic («autonomous member of the free Federal Union of Soviet Republics»), the Bolsheviks placed emphasis on the class principle. Thus, according to the Declaration the main goal of the KazASSR was «total destruction of exploitation of man by man», «the complete elimination of the division of society into classes», «struggle against the exploiters and the establishment of a socialist organization of society». Nevertheless, the historical significance of the Soviet statehood in the form of autonomy was in determining the boundaries of the Republic. Into the structure of the republic entered in the borders until 1917 the following areas: Akmola with the Atbasar, Akmolinsk, Kokchetav, Petropavlovsk districts Omsk and a part of the Omsk district; the Semipalatinsk region with the Pavlodar, Ust-Kamenogorsk, Zaisan, Karkaralinsk districts; Turgay with Kustanai, Aktyubinsk, Irgiz and Turgay districts; Ural with Lbischensk, Ural, Temir, Guryev districts. In addition to these areas in the structure of the KazASSR were the Mangystau district, 4th and 5th volost Krasnovodsky district of the Trans-Caspian region, and also from the Astrakhan province into the structure of the KazASSR were transferred the Sinemorskaya volost, The Bukey horde and the territories inhabited by Kazakhs and adjacent to the first and the second Primorsky regions.

Orenburg Province with Orenburg that became the first capital of the republic until 1925 entered the KazASSR the structure. According to official data in the autumn of 1920 the Republic's population was 5,046,000 men, of whom 46, 6% were the Kazakhs. Thus, on the large territory of Kazakhstan, was restored statehood of Kazakhstan. Although in its base laid class principles, and it was created in the form of Soviets, however, it was the beginning of the

restoration of the territorial integrity of Kazakhstan. It was of great importance for the historical fate of the Kazakh people in the future. The Constituent Congress of the Soviets elected the Central Committee of the KazAASR (Kazakh Central Executive Committee) of 76 men and 25 candidates. Chairman of the Kazakh Central Executive Committee became S. Mendeshev. Kazakh Central Executive Committee approved the composition of the Republic – the Council of People's Commissars of 14 men and gave him full executive power. Chairman of the SNK KazASSR was appointed VA Radus-Zenkovich[50].

But in the structure of the KazASSR did not enter in southern and south-eastern regions (the Syrdarya and Semirechenskaya region). Until 1918, they were a part of Turkestan territory, and then became part of the Turkestan Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic, created in the spring of 1918. The end of the civil war and the formation of the Soviet Union in 1922 contributed to the further developing of the process of nation and state building in the country. In this connection, a number of representatives of indigenous peoples of Central Asia began to periodically raise the issue of the restoration of the entire ethnic territory of one or another people within the limits of a single national statehood. This issue had taken a complex character in the Kazakh and the Turkestan autonomous republics that were entered the RSFSR. In particular, there systematically raised the question of the necessity to reunite the Syrdarya and Semirechye regions with the Kazakh ASSR. At the same time there was a question about the division of the multinational Turkestan Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic and the establishment of national statehood and national-state formations of the Uzbeks, Turkmen, Tajiks, Kyrgyz, Karakalpaks. In this connection, it should be emphasized that the state entities which existed before the delimitation of Central Asia: the Turkestan ASSR, the Bukhara and Khorezm People's Soviet Republics were established in the pre-revolutionary (before October 1917) borders of the Turkestan general-governorship, the Bukhara Emirate and the Khiva Khanate. They did not coincide with the ethnic boundaries of the settlement of

[50] See.: Istoriya Kazahstana s drevnejshih vremen do nashih dnej v pyati tomah. – T. 4. – Almaty: Atamura, 2010. – C. 175-176.

the main peoples of Central Asia. Each of the peoples of Central Asia did not form a compact majority of the population in any of these republics. Thus, the majority (66.5%) of the Uzbeks lived in the Turkestan Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic, where, however, they made up less than a half the of population (41.4%), 22.2% of the Uzbeks lived in Bukhara and 11.3% – in the Khorezm Republic. Over 40% of the Turkmen were in the Turkestan Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic, 20.8% – in the Khorezm Republic and 27% – in the Bukhara republic, but they nowhere made up the majority of the population; in Turkestan ASSR there were only 4.7%, in Bukhara – 10.6% in Khorezm – 28,7%. The Tajiks lived mainly in the two republics: in the the TurkASSR there were only 7.7%, in Bukhara – 31%. The Kyrgyz settled mainly in the Turkestan Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic (98.6%), but they were only 10.8% in relation to the population of the Republic. More than two-thirds of the Karakalpaks inhabited the Turkestan ASSR, where they accounted for only 1.4% of the population. The Kazakhs lived in Central Asia, were scattered all overe, the three republics and everywhere were in the minority: in the Turkestan Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic – 19.3%, in Bukhara – 1.5%, in Khorezm – 3.5%. In January 1924, the Government of the Kazakh ASSR practically raised the question before the Central Soviet government on joining the Kazakh territories of the Semirechye and Syrdarya regions to Kazakhstan. In the nation and state delimitation were interested all indigenous peoples of Turkestan In January 31, 1924 the Organizing Bureau of the Central Committee of the RCP (b), having considered a preliminary proposal about delimitation, charged the secretary of the Central Committee of the RCP (b) Y. Rudzutak with convening a meeting on this issue in Tashkent. The meeting was held in March 1924. The majority of its participants (A. Rakhimbaev, N. Aitakov, S. Asfendiyarov et al.) were in favor of a national-territorial delimitation of the Central Asian region. There were also speeches of another orientation. So, the chairman of the Central Asian Economic Council M. Pakutsky, referring to the expediency of «economic unity» of the region, insisted on uniting all the republics of the TurkASSR. S. Kozhanov said that «Turkic tribes constitute a single Turkic-speaking people», which «should not be

artificial torn». The meeting rejected S. Pakutsky and M. Kozhanov's opinions and approved the proposal on the national – state (territorial) delimitation of Central Asia.

At the end of 1924 a joint commission Asian Bureau of Central Committee of the RCP (b) and the Central Committee of Communist Party of Turkestan on preparing and holding delimitation of Central Asia was established. Having examined the Commission materials, Asian Bureau of the Central Committee of the RCP (B) on 12 May 1924 took a decision: to establish two Soviet republics – Uzbek and Turkmen, and two autonomous regions – Tajik in the structure of the Uzbek SSR and Karakirgiz in the structure of the RSFSR, and Kazakh districts of Turkestan to include in the Kazakh ASSR. The central Committee of the RCP (b) 12 June 1924 supported the decision of the Central Asian Bureau of the Central Committee of the RCP (B). During the summer of 1924 Central Asian Bureau dealt specifically with solving a complex of issues, overcoming many difficulties connected with the division both the territory, nad material and financial values, and also with the establishment of the principles of the new administrative zoning. The Second Session of the CEC of the USSR 27 October 1924 adopted a resolution on the national-territorial delimitation of Central Asia and the formation "on the principle of self-determination of nationalities" of the Uzbek SSR with the autonomous Tajik Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic, the Turkmen Soviet Socialist Republic, the Karakirgiz Autonomous Region within the RSFSR. A large part of the former Turkestan ASSR, being the ethnic Kazakh territory, joined the Kazakh ASSR.

The newly formed Karakalpak region also entered the structure of the Kazakh ASSR. In the connection with the formation of new republics and regions in the November 1924 session of the Turkestan, Bukhara and Khorezm Central Executive Committees of the Soviets took a desiition on stopping their activities. As a result of the delimitation to Kazakhstan were passed Kazaly, Akmechetsky, Shymkent and most of the Aulie-Ata districts, a part of the Tashkent and Myrzashul districts of the former Syrdarya region. From the Semirechye region to the KazASSR joined the Almaty, Zharkent, Lepsinsk, Kapal (Taldykorgan) districts, Georgiev, Shu, Karakonuz

volosts of the Pishpek (Bishkek) district. As a result, the territory of the Kazakh SSR increased by almost 700 thousand sq. kilometers, i.e. by one third and amounted to 2.7 million sq. kilometers, and the population had increased by almost 1.5 million of men its total number reached 5230 thousand men. According to the Census of 1926, the Kazakhs made up about two-thirds (61.3%) of the total population of the Republic. Joining a vast territory with rich economic resources and an extensive irrigation network, multi-million livestock favorably affected developing productive forces of Kazakhstan. In this regard, there was considered a question on a new zoning of the Republic. During its discussion there arose a question on transfering the capital of the Republic from Orenburg (which became the capital of the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic in October 1920) to another city. This was stipulated with the new historical conditions, the new features of geographical, socio-economic and cultural development of Kazakhstan. Besides Orenburg geographically was located far from the main mass of the Kazakh people. There were prepared several versions of the future administrative-territorial zoning of Kazakhstan. As a capital were offered Aktobe, Akmola, Shymkent, Aulie-Ata, Ak-Mechet. It was decided to transfer the capital of Kazakhstan to Ak-Mechet. In April 6, 1925 Presidium of the Central Executive Committee adopted a resolution on the withdrawal of the Orenburg province from the structure of the Kazakh ASSR. In the Orenburg province withdrawn from the structure of the Kazakh ASSR entered its districts with the predominantly Russian population, and also a part of the Ilek district of the Ural Province. Administrative reorganization of the Kazakh ASSR had completed by the beginning of 1925. The Kazakh ASSR now united the Adai district (equated to the province), Aktobinsk, Akmolinsk, Uralsk, Semipalatinsk, Kostanai, Jetysu, Syrdarya Provinces and the Karakalpak autonomous region. In the first half of 1925 the main public institutions of the republic moved to the Ak-Mechet. Here, by the way, it should be noted that in sovietology of the far foreign countries and partly in the emigre literature there is a single negative assessment of the fact of the national-state delimitation of Central Asia and the formation of new Soviet republics and regions. So, the first Kazakh political immigrant

Mustafa Chokai considered the event as forcible separation of the Turkestan Turks by the Soviet power with the purpose to destroy their «national and political unity». He argued that as a result of the national-territorial delimitation the people lost the historical name of the country, what the Turkestan had been (the country of the Turks). The Soviet government clearly understood the danger of uniting national movements of the Turkestan Turks. Thus, the Bolshevik leadership considered the delimitation and formation of national republics, as a way of weakening the Basmach movement in Central Asia, which was based on the unity of different social strata of different peoples. This was openly declared by the member of the Communist Party of Turkestan A. Rakhimbaev in his report «On the national-territorial delimitation of Turkestan» at the meeting in Tashkent in March 10, 1924. So, he publicly stated: "From the standpoint of our Party, this organization (i.e. homogeneous national republics) «is beneficial because if a poor Uzbek will fight with the Uzbek kulak, Turkmens with the Turkmens, Kyrgyz – with the Kyrgyz, then the class struggle will not be obscured by national moments». However, the reunion of the Kazakh lands was an important event in the history of the nation. Although this reunion took place in the framework of the Kazakh Soviet statehood built on the principles of the division of society into classes, where with every day the dominance of communist ideology strengthened, it marked the beginning of a new stage of national consolidation of the Kazakh people. The same can be said about the results of the national-state delimitation with respect to other indigenous peoples of the region. On 15-19 April, 1925 in the new capital of the republic was held the V Congress of Soviets of Kazakhstan. The Congress restored the historical name of an indigenous people – the Kazakhs and renamed the Kirghiz ASSR the Kazakh Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic. Simultaneously, the Congress changed the name of the new capital of the Republic: the Ak-Mechet city was renamed into Kyzyl-Orda («Red Capital»). The congress took an appeal to the citizens of the Republic, which ended with the words: «Ahead – a period of the economic revival of the Kazakh Republic, the period of the struggle for raising the productive forces of the country, for raising living standards and cultural level of all the workers living in

KASSR[51]». In 1936, the Kazakh ASSR was transformed into the Federal Republic, what was sealed in the Constitution of the USSR in 1936 on the basis and in the accordance with the Constitution of the USSR was worked out a project of the Constitution of the Kazakh SSR. The Tenth Extraordinary All-Kazakh Congress of Soviets, held in late March 1937 adopted the Constitution of the Kazakh SSR, consisting of 11 chapters. Under this law, the Kazakh SSR was characterized as a socialist state of workers and peasants. It declared that all the power belongs to the work people in the face of the Soviets of Deputies of the work people. The socialist system of economy and the socialist property of the means of production were recognized as the economic basis of the Kazakh SSR. Socialist property had two forms: state and collective-farm and cooperative. Small private economy of individual peasants and handicraftsmen «... based on personal labor and excluding the exploitation of the labor of others» was allowed. It was started that the economic life of the Kazakh SSR was determined and directed by the state national economic plan. In one of the chapters of the Constitution of 1936 was also declared that the Kazakh SSR had voluntarily united with other Soviet republics in the Soviet Union – a union state and has the right freely to secede from the USSR. In the Constitution was determined the administrative-territorial structure and indicated that the territory of the Kazakh SSR could not be changed without its consent. There was recognized a single union citizenship and a citizenship of the Kazakh SSR. Competences of the Kazakh SSR represented by its highest bodies of power and administration were precisely defined. The highest organ of the state power of the Kazakh SSR was the Supreme Soviet, which was recognized the only legislative body. Deputies of the Supreme Council were elected for four years by citizens. The Supreme Council elected the Supreme Council Presidium consisting of a chairman, two deputies, a secretary and 15 members. The Presidium of the Supreme Council got the right to issue decrees and other regulatory authorities.

[51] This part sets out on the basis of Corresponding Member of National Academy of Sciences of Kazakhstan, Laureate of State Award of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Honored worker of science Kenes Nurpeis' article: Pogranichnyj vopros // Kontinent №21(34). 2000. Avaiable: http://www.continent.kz/2000/21/20.html.

Deputies of the Supreme Council enjoyed parliamentary immunity. Also, the Constitution defined the structure of the Central government. The highest executive and administrative organ of the state power of the Kazakh SSR was the Council of People's Commissars, that was responsible and accountable to the Supreme Council, it's Presidium. At the structure of the CPC Kazakh SSR were created People's Commissariats: of the Union-Republican and Republican. Local authorities were the Soviets of work people deputies, who were elected by citizens for two years. The Soviets elected executive committees, which were the executive and administrative bodies. There were determined shapes of the Soviets' work, frequency of their convocation, the structure of the executive committees, objects of reference of these bodies. The structure of local executive bodies was constantly changing, that was why the Constitution was amended. At the end of 1936, the territory of the Kazakh SSR was divided into 8 regions. Then, in January 1938 appeared, three new areas: Kyzylorda, Pavlodar and Guriev, and eighteen months later, in October 1939, three more – Semipalatinsk, Zhambyl and Akmolinsk. Thus, the new Constitution of the USSR declared each republic the right freely to secede from the USSR, but it was stipulated that the territory of the Union Federal Republic could not be changed without the consent of the Central government. The Constitution fixed the provision on equal force of All-Union laws on the territory of all the Union republics. Therefore, the All-Union Constitution enshrines the priority of the Union legislation over the Republican. It did not provide for the right of national authorities to suspend or to appeal acts of the Union bodies. For the citizens of the USSR was established common union citizenship, each citizen of a Union Republic was a citizen of the USSR. Although the Constitution of the USSR had a declarative character and the republic received no true independence and self-government, we must not forget that the gathering of the territory and the legislative consolidation of its borders was thanks to the Soviet people[52].

[52] This part sets out on the basis of Corresponding Member of National Academy of Sciences of Kazakhstan, Laureate of State Award of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Honored worker of science Kenes Nurpeis' article: Pogranichnyj vopros // Kontinent №21(34). 2000. Avaiable: http://www.continent.kz/2000/21/20.html.

Control questions:

1. Which project of national and state structure of Kazakhstan did the Alash party leaders offer?
2. What position on national-state arrangement of Kazakhstan did the Ush Zhuz Party members hold?
3. What was the historical significance of the Kirrevkom / Kazrevkom activities?
4. Which territories did enter the KazASSR as a result of the national-state delimitation of Central Asia lands in 1924?
5. Оцените деятельность советского правительства по национально-государственному строительству в Казахстане в 1920-1930-ые гг.

6.1.2. Soviet modernization of economic relations in Kazakhstan Modernization/Industralization in Kazakhstan

The XIV Congress of the CPSU (b) in December 1925 outlined a course for the country's industrialization. What is Industrialization? «Industrialization is the overall change in conditions accompanying a society's movement population and resources from farm production to manufacturing production and other associated services». To Stalinist leaders, building socialism in one country meant, first and foremost, modernising and expanding the country's basic industrial sectors: iron and steel production, mining, metallurgy and machine building, energy generation and timber extraction, and, of course, agriculture. During the 1930 s, but especially in the years of the First Five-Year Plan, 1928-32, the Soviet state poured funds into the construction of heavy industrial projects, a 'bacchanalian' orgy of planning, spending and construction, as one economist put it. The results were dramatic, truly heroic on a historical scale, even while enormously wasteful and costly in both human and financial terms. These years of the Soviet industrial revolution have been made famous by the names of some of the world's largest construction projects[53].

The implementation of this policy in Kazakhstan has encountered with a number of difficulties associated with its colonial past and backwardness in development. In the second half of the 1920s and

[53] David R. Shearer Stalinism, 1928-1940 in The Cambridge History of Russia. Vol. III: The Twentieth Century / Edited by R. Suny. Cambridge University Press. – P. 192.

early 1930s in Kazakhstan, there flared up a fierce debate on the ways of industrialization in Kazakhstan. There were several points of view. Some argued that the transition from a camel to socialism was impossible, and the nomadic way of life – a feature of the Kazakh people, and therefore the industrialization would undermine the national identity of the Kazakhs. Others tried to prove that the implanting industry, creating working class was unreal for Kazakhstan, the backward Kazakh people would not sustain paces of industrialization, «A Kazakh in any case would not work, there is pulled by the steppe». The third believed that Kazakhstan should develop in the structure of the Union, without taking into account special interests of the Republic. The fourth said that the outlying districts should not be remain only the source of raw materials and during the industrialization it was necessary to take into account the interests of the Republic. As it was shown by practice, the first two points of view turned out not to be viable. Fighting broke out between the last two.

The point of view of the party and the Soviet leadership of Kazakhstan defended F.I. Goloshchekin and the Government of the Republic in the faces of U. Isayev, K. Sarymuldaev. They advocated the necessity and expediency of the development of small and medium-sized enterprises, mainly in the processing of agricultural raw materials and defended the idea on a raw materials direction of the republic industry. F.I. Goloshchekin at the VI All-Kazakh Party Conference (15-23 November 1927) convinced: «By the nature of our development and in the accordance with the general tasks of the Soviet Union and our local peculiarities and tasks – KASSR must enter the overall five-year period as a raw material base of the Union industry on supplying livestock and agricultural products ... The Union industry can be dependent on us in the spheres of wool, meat, skin, let alone the fact that we have technical cultures, which will be of great importance for our future development»[54].

The position of the F. Goloshchekin and the leaders of the Kazkraykom of the CPSU (b) supported I. Zelensky – Chairman of

[54] VI Vsekazahskaya konferenciya VKP (b). 15-23 noyabrya 1927 g. Kyzyl-Orda, 1927. S.52-59 // Istoriya Kazahstana s drevnejshih vremen do nashih dnej v pyati tomah. T. 4. – Almaty: Atamura, 2010. – P. 335.

the Central Asian bureau of the Central Committee of the CPSU (b). He wrote that «the task of the Central Asian republics should be in the first place in developing those branches of the agricultural economy, which weaken and reduce our dependence on the capitalist world»[55]. The main opponent of F. Goloshchekin on the industrialization of Kazakhstan paths at the VI Party Conference was S. Sadvakasov. In his speech he said: «The question of the industry – is the fate of a Kazakh poor man, the fate of the Kazakh poor man is not only through the village, but also through the city, for the XII Congress said into vain that we must overcome the cursed legacy of the autocracy, expressing in the fact that national borderlines would not turn exclusively into raw materials areas»[56]. S. Sadvakasov defended the idea that the Republic industry should be developed on the basis of economic expediency, «there where there is skin, there to construct tanneries, where there is wool-wool-washing and cloth factories». The most complete views of S. Sadvakasov on ways and methods of development of industry and transport in Kazakhstan in the conditions of industrialization were stated in his detailed article «On Nationalities and Nationalists». In it S. Sadvakasov emphasized that «if the Russian imperialist bourgeoisie only pumped out raw materials from borderline areas, in planting plants and factories at its hand, the socialist industry should be developed according to the principle of economic expediency», «it is necessary to bring the industry to the sources of raw materials»[57].

At the same time S. Sadvakasov pointed out that for the development of industry in Kazakhstan, despite a number of serious challenges, there are all the necessary conditions: «not only raw materials, but also the availability of labor and fuel», «multi-billion dollar reserves of coal and oil»[58]. S.. Sadvakasov provided arguments on the economic expediency of the construction enterprizes on the

[55] See.: Istoriya Kazahstana s drevnejshih vremen do nashih dnej v pyati tomah. T. 4. – Almaty: Atamura, 2010. – P. 335.

[56] See: Istoriya Kazahstana s drevnejshih vremen do nashih dnej v pyati tomah. T. 4. – Almaty: Atamura, 2010. – P. 336.

[57] See: Istoriya Kazahstana s drevnejshih vremen do nashih dnej v pyati tomah. T. 4. – Almaty: Atamura, 2010. – P. 336.

[58] See: Istoriya Kazahstana s drevnejshih vremen do nashih dnej v pyati tomah. T. 4. – Almaty: Atamura, 2010. – P. 336.

basis of available resources, elimination of oncoming traffic on the railways. He admitted that «theoretical controversy with the Secretary of the Kazkraykom – hopeless», but he was never tired of criticizing his views. S. Sadvakasov wrote: «Goloshchekin puts industry to the tail of agriculture, thus predetermining the eternal peasant existence of Kazakhstan. Why comrade Goloshchekin cannot, or rather does not want to go further wool washing plants, while it suggest itself organization of cloth factories. Is not it better to export by railways from Kazakhstan fabric cloth than two times drag with washed wool, then back with the Moscow cloth of this wool»[59].

S. Sadvakasov also refuted I. Zelensky's statement, if there was a tendency of the nationals to build a closed economy in each Republic. He asked: «What was the theory to imply that to export cotton from Central Asia – it's good, and to export textiles – a sign of a closed economy. And he asserted: It doesnot seem such a way, comrade Zelensky.! Just from the point of view of economic expediency, it is necessary to bring the industry to the sources of raw materials»[60].

The desire of the National Republics to the construction of industrial enterprises on the basis of available resources, was also criticized from the Centre. Chairman of People's Commissars of the USSR Union A.M. Rykov at the IV All-Union Congress of Soviets, said: «We can make very many and very great mistakes, if stand on the view that industrialization means developing at any price the industry in each administrative unit ... in separate parts of our Union they are striving to create a closed economy»[61].

S. Sadvakasov appreciated these words of A.M. Rykov as an alarm signal for the national borderlands, which, unlike other provinces, regions and republics «either have nothing or have very little industry». Thus, in the heated debate that spread in the second half of the 1920s and early 1930 s. on Kazakhstan's industrialization

[59] See: Istoriya Kazahstana s drevnejshih vremen do nashih dnej v pyati tomah. T. 4. – Almaty: Atamura, 2010. – P. 338.

[60] See: Istoriya Kazahstana s drevnejshih vremen do nashih dnej v pyati tomah. T. 4. – Almaty: Atamura, 2010. – P. 338.

[61] See: Istoriya Kazahstana s drevnejshih vremen do nashih dnej v pyati tomah. T. 4. – Almaty: Atamura, 2010. – P. 338.

paths, won the position of the party and government leadership of Kazakhstan headed by F.I. Goloshchekin, and it predetermined the direction of the raw material industry of Kazakhstan for the entire Soviet period.

Today analyzing, the results of the industrialization, it should refrain from unilateral assessments. So, on the one hand, it should be borne in mind that there made huge capital investments, in the result of which Kazakhstan had become an industrialized republic, where the share of the industrial sector in 1940 amounted to 63.7%. The result of the industrialization development in the prewar years were 700 new industrial and transport enterprises. In all 1940 2.5 thousand industrial companies operated in Kazakhstan. In total, Kazakhstan had become an industrial and agrarian republic: in 1940 the share of industry in the national economy of the republic reached 60%. On the map of Kazakhstan as a result of urbanization in 1939 were 81 cities, while in 1926 there were 44 cities. Large capital investments were made in geological expeditions equipment, construction of new plants, communications, supply of enterprises with materials, equipment, specialists, skilled labor workforce. In addition, the construction of industrial enterprises, as well as the railways was carried out in desert and semi desert regions (the Karaganda coal basin, the Balkhash copper smelter, the Chimkent and Irtysh lead plants, the Zhezkazgan and Kounrad mines, the Emba oilfields, the Turksib, Guryev-Kandagach, Orsk, Akmola-Kartaly, Uralsk-Ilets railways), so there were demanded investments of additional funds for the construction of communications, housing, drinking water-pipe and other infrastructure. For example, «Karagandaugol» – was not only 17 mines in 1931, but the hydroelectric power, the Nura water supply, 1933 and concentrating mill, 1933. For industrialization of Kazakhstan was a characteristic higher pace as compared to the other republics. Industrial development in Kazakhstan was carried out at the expense of new construction. For Kazakhstan it was characterized by the construction of the largest enterprises – complexes, which were armed with the latest technologies ensuring the most efficient use of raw materials and energy. Industrial complexes played a huge role not only in terms of production, the labor force contingent, but also on socio-economic and cultural value, played of city-forming role. Such were

the «Karagandaugol», «Kazpolitmetall», «Altaypolitmetall», Aktobe chemical, Semipalatinsk meat-packing, Guryev fish cannery, Almaty fruits and vegetables, Semipalatinsk cloth industrial complexes. Another advantage of industrialization was concurrent development of transport, especially the railway construction. Development of the richest deposits of coal, oil and non-ferrous metals has demanded a speedy solution of the transport problem on the vast territory of Kazakhstan. Not all the planned lines were built. However, the Republic railway network increased by 50%. In those years was built the Turkestan-Siberian Railway, which connected Siberia with Central Asia and South Kazakhstan. Construction of the main parts of Trans-line, played a major role in the development of natural resources in Central Kazakhstan, and the Rubtsovsk-Ridder line – for servicing non-ferrous metallurgy enterprises of East Kazakhstan. Also there appeared the Uralsk-Iletsk road which linked the western regions of the Republic with the industrially developed regions of Russia. In the years of industrialization evolved with high paces also developed electricity. Power plants were built not only in order to provide with energy large industrial enterprises, but also the population and the entire infrastructure. During the first two five-year plans were put into operation the Karaganda and Karatau CPS, Thermoelectric power stations of the Balkhash copper plant, chemical plant in the Aktobe, the Semipalatinsk meat-packing plant, CPS of the Shymkent lead plant, the Ulbinsk hydroelectric and diesel power in the Emba oil fields. On the other hand, created in the years of industrialization industry had a pronounced raw-material direction. In Kazakhstan, were mainly built heavy industry enterprises, with the primary development of extractive industries branches: coal, oil, non-ferrous metals. Thus, in specialization in the All-Union scale republic had a narrow specialization. In Kazakhstan, there was almost no mechanical engineering industry, metal-working was provided with repair workshops and mechanical shops of separate plants, there was not ferrous metallurgy, production of a number of building materials. Machinery, machine tools and equipment in Kazakhstan were supplied from Moscow, Leningrad, the Urals, the Ukraine. Besides, we should not forget about shortcomings of the industrialization inherent in the whole country. They have been clearly told by Mark

Harrison[62]: «The idea of industrialisation supported by a government transfer of resources from agriculture owes much to Russian and Soviet history. In the nineteenth century, Imperial government officials stressed the role of agriculture in supplying food for the urban population, taxes to pay for government support of the industrial sector and exports to pay for industrial technology from abroad. Populist critics stressed the extent to which government was buying industrial modernisation at the expense of peasant sacrifice and agricultural stagnation. After the Russian revolution, in the interwar years Preobrazhenskii (Trotskii's economic adviser), then Stalin himself stressed in different ways the possibility of paying for public sector industrial investment programmes out of peasant incomes. Preobrazhenskii's views were formed in the mid-1920s in the context of a mixed economy; he considered that an agricultural surplus could be generated for public investment by means of taxation of farm incomes and nonequivalent exchange (pushing up the prices of manufactures on the rural-urbanmarket to make the peasants buy dear and sell food cheap). Stalin, at first opposed to this idea, came round to the same gento the same general orientation in 1928-9. The context was now one of headlong transition from a mixed economy to a system dominated by public and cooperative ownership, increasingly regulated by physical controls. Instead of taxation and nonequivalent exchange through the market, Stalinist methods of getting resources out of agriculture relied more on simple confiscation of food surpluses»[63].

Control questions:

1. What projects on industrialization of Kazakhstan were there in the middle of the 1920 s of the XX c.?
2. What was the peculiarity of the Bolshevic's project on industrialization of Kazakhstan.
3. Analyze the main results of industrialization of Kazakhstan from the today's position. Give concrete facts for basimg your point of view.

[62] Mark Harrison is professor of Russian history at the Department of Economics and CAGE, University of Warwick (England).

[63] Mark Harrison Soviet Agriculture and Industrialization. Электронный ресурс. Режим доступа: https://www2.warwick.ac.uk/fac/soc/economics/staff/mharrison/public/agriculture 1996.pdf.

Tasks for independent study:

Write an essay of 500 words on the topic: «What project industrialization of Kazakhstan did the Kazakh national intellectuals defend»

Collectivization of agriculture: intentions and repercussion in Kazakhstan

In November 1927, Joseph Stalin launched his «revolution from above» by setting two extraordinary goals for Soviet domestic policy: rapid industrialization and collectivization of agriculture. His aims were to erase all traces of the capitalism that had entered under the New Economic Policy and to transform the Soviet Union as quickly as possible, without regard to cost, into an industrialized and completely socialist state. Stalin's First Five-Year Plan, adopted by the party in 1928, called for rapid industrialization of the economy, with an emphasis on heavy industry. The First Five-Year Plan also called for transforming Soviet agriculture from predominantly individual farms into a system of large state collective farms. The Communist regime believed that collectivization would improve agricultural productivity and would produce grain reserves sufficiently large to feed the growing urban labor force. The anticipated surplus was to pay for industrialization. Collectivization was further expected to free many peasants for industrial work in the cities and to enable the party to extend its political dominance over the remaining peasantry. Before the start of implementing Lenin's idea of transference of agriculture to socialist path, the State undertook a number of steps aimed at curtailing the New Economic Policy. At the end of the 1920s in the Soviet Union began the forced agricultural laying and a sharp increase of taxation, which carried out in the form of confiscatory tax policy. The reason for large-scale expropriation action was to find the funds for the implementing Stalin's plan of socialist industrialization, which involved a disproportionate increase of investments in the industry. The source of the confiscatory tax policy became the price scissors on industrial and agricultural goods. Thus, the state dictated to consumers and especially the agricultural sector monopolistically high prices for industrial products, while the purchase prices of agricultural

commodities were extremely low. For example, in 1927-1928, the government purchase price of grain was 40% lower grain prices on the black market, and the next year – even by 50%. Thus, the price difference led to the fact that practically the peasantry was charged to overtax, which was supposed to be sent to the industrial sector. But the peasants refused to hand over grain to the state voluntarily, what resulted in the crisis of harvesting of grain in 1927-1928. In the prevention of open conflict with the peasantry, the state had a number of economic tools and levers. So, it would be possible to soften the policy of strict control over prices. Or make purchases of grain abroad, as by N. Bukharin proposed. But Stalin chose to deploy repressions against hundreds and hundreds of thousands of peasants. It was manifested in the activities of widely spread all over the country extraordinary grain procurement campaigns. In Kazakhstan for implementing the tasks of grain procurement was applied so-called the Ural-Siberian method. The method consists in the fact that at the meeting of the poor and middle peasants were elected facilitating grain-procurement commissions that decided how much grain must pass kulak bay farms, and how much – middle peasant ones. There was also developed a repressive mechanism, if the decision of the gathering was not implemented, farms would have to pay a fine - fivefold of the primary quota or to lose their freedom. As a result, during the grain-procurement campaigns in Kazakhstan, as well as all over the country, was unleashed the strongest administrative terror. Here campaigns for laying in livestock, grain and other agricultural products were of the nature of violent withdrawals of the War communism times. In the grain-procurement campaigns in Kazakhstan were also carried out large-scale anti-peasant repressions. Besides the supertax, which was realized by the grain-procurement campaigns in searching of funds for industrialization the state toughened the tax regime. Already in 1926-1927 the amount of the tax increased by 87% compared with the previous period.

The XV Congress of the CPSU (b) in December 1927 proclaimed policy of mass collectivization of the village. All over the country the implementation of this task was carried out by force and was sped up. Kazakhstan was included in that to the regional group

where collectivization was supposed to be completed in the spring of 1932. Although in this directive were excluded nomadic and semi-nomadic areas, in the livestock areas paces of collectivization were not less than in the grain areas, and in some cases, even overtook them. By February 1932 in Kazakhstan, 87% of collective farmers' households and 51.8% of individual peasants had completely lost their livestock[64].

The collectivized livestock was gathered on collective and trade farms, which in practice often meant a steppe plot, enclosed with fences or pegs with lassos. The concentration of large number of animals in one place violated the main ecosystem principle of the nomadic mode of production – the exact correlation of the livestock number and natural water and fodder resources (feed and water). As a result, there began the mass death of livestock from starvation and epizootic diseases caused by overcrowding the cattle. Thus, the bulk of the farms lost their cattle. So, collectivization dealt a blow on the rural economy, having destroyed both the productive forces of the village and their functional structures. Along with the collectivization in Kazakhstan was carried out, a policy of forcible transfer of nomads and semi-nomads to sedentary forms of economy and life. The total destruction of the economy had led to mass starvation of the population, what had very dramatic demographic consequences. Today, in the academic publication of history of Kazakhstan is stated that the Kazakh population decline as a result of the death of hunger and moving outside the country amounted to about 2 million men [65]. In addition the authors of the section on the collectivization emphasize that the question of the number of famine victims is still open.

Scales of the starvation caused with total destruction of economy were indeed terrible. According to NiccolòPianciola «Its most disastrous results were in Kazakstan, culminating in the great famine of 1931-1933 in which between1.3 and 1.5 million Kazaks (between 35% and 38% of the total population, the highest percentage of any

[64] See: Istoriya Kazahstana s drevnejshih vremen do nashih dnej v pyati tomah. T. 4. – Almaty: Atamura, 2010. – P. 259.

[65] See: Istoriya Kazahstana s drevnejshih vremen do nashih dnej v pyati tomah. T. 4. – Almaty: Atamura, 2010. – P. 285.

nationality in the USSR) lost their lives[66]. Having lost their livestock, inhabitants of the Steppe were deprived the traditional for them meat and milk allowance. Fishing, hunting and gathering did not save the situation. Bread in the aul because of the crop failure was also absent, and that they had was confiscated according to the grain-procurement. To leave the disaster zone was not always possible as without horses and camels a nomad could not overcome huge distances. Driven by poverty, masses of people spread about cities, villages, railway stations. In the places of people concentration broke out pockets of the typhoid fever epidemic. A great damage to the indigenous population was inflicted by moving on. A quarter of the population, that is 1030 thousand. people migrated during the famine outside of the Republic. 616 thousand of the Kazakhs went forever (of which 200 thousand migrated abroad in China, Mongolia, Afghanistan, Iran and Turkey, but 414 thousand later returned to Kazakhstan.

Famine and epidemics related with it, as well as moving on strongly deformed the demographic picture. The former population number was restored only in 40 years, in 1969. What were the causes of the tragic events? At the base of the tragedy was the logic of the organization of the Stalinist model of society, in which the human factor was completely ignored for political and ideological purposes[67].

Control questions:

1. What was the essence of the transforming agriculture from predominantly individual farms into a system of large state collective farms? What were peculiarities of this process in Kazakhstan?
2. Give the succession of the Soviet government actions on the transforming agriculture from predominantly individual farms into a system of large state collective farms.
3. Why did the socialist modernization of agriculture lead to the tragical consequences in Kazakhstan?

[66] NiccolòPianciola. Famine in the Steppe. The collectivization of agriculture and the Kazakh herdsmen, 1928-1934. Avaiable: http://monderusse.revues.org/2623?file=1.

[67] See: Istoriya Kazahstana s drevnejshih vremen do nashih dnej v pyati tomah. T. 4. – Almaty: Atamura, 2010. – P. 287.

Task for in dependent study:

Read the following article:

1. Isabelle Ohayon, The Kazakh Famine: The Beginnings of Sedentarization, Online Encyclopedia of Mass Violence, [online], published on 28 September 2013, accessed 24 May 2016, URL: http://www.massviolence.org/The-Kazakh-Famine-The-Beginnings, ISSN 1961-9898.
2. Cameron, S. (2016). THE HUNGRY STEPPE: FAMINE, MASS VIOLENCE AND THE MAKING OF SOVIET KAZAKHSTAN. [online] Available at: https://www.irex.org/sites/default/files/Sarah%20Cameron%20scholar%20research%20brief_0.pdf [Accessed 24 May 2016].
3. NiccolòPianciola, « Famine in the steppe », Cahiers du monde russe [Enligne], 45/1-2 | 2004, misenligne le 19 janvier 2007, Consulté le 09 janvier 2014. URL : http://monderusse.revues.org/2623.

Write a paper in 5 pages times new romans 12 интервал 1,5 spacing on the topic: A comparative analysis of the Modern Western scholars views on the famine in Kazakhstan causes.

6.1.3. Implementation of soviet cultural modernization project in Kazakhstan, 1920-1930

The Cultural Revolution according the prominent Sheila Fitzpatric is defines by contemporary Soviet historians as a necessary part of the transition to a socialist society. Its occurrence conforms to a general law governing the development of socialism. A prerequisite for the Cultural Revolution was a Socialist Revolution. The Cultural Revolution was headed by the Communist Party, which was guided by the ideas democratization of culture, establishment of equality in improving cultural opportunities, the rapid growth of the educational level of the population, and forming new intelligentsia. The Cultural Revolution, in contrast to the political revolution has never been sudden or forceful. It is a gradual process of ideological transformation. In the process of cultural transformation of society, the Bolsheviks were guided by Lenin's ideas. The Communist Party through the state and public organizations system directed the development of national education, cultural and educational work, literature and art, conducted work on the ideological and political education of the people in the spirit of the Marxist-Leninist ideology. The state

financed all branches of culture, took care of widening their material base. During the years of Socialist construction in the Soviet society had established the Marxist-Leninist ideology. Was wiped out mass illiteracy, was provided a high level of education for all the population. What were the methods and results of realizing this policy in Kazakhstan? The Cultural Revolution was one of the most important points in Lenin's plan for building socialism in Kazakhstan, as well as all over the country. On the one hand, the task was to raise the general educational level of the population in order to ensure the successful modernization of the economy. On the other hand, it was important to ensure the perception of the Marxist-Leninist ideology by wider strata of society. In implementing this policy the Bolsheviks adhered to two basic principles – target financing and implementation of the planned start. This enabled the Soviet state to implement fully the task of raising the level of education. This process began with the elimination of illiteracy and ended with the creation of the Soviet educational system – from primary to higher education. In Kazakhstan, the main focus of the cultural transformations became an elimination of mass illiteracy. With the consolidation of Soviet power in Kazakhstan the process of the elimination of illiteracy began taking an organized character. Regulations of the People's Commissariat of Education of the Turkestan Republic on organizing courses on elimination of illiteracy among the adult population of towns and villages of the July 26, 1918 (it was taken earlier than SNK decree on the elimination of illiteracy in the RSFSR of December 26, 1919) provided for organization of courses in each borough and the village. Regulations emphasized that the courses should be teach not only reading and writing, but b) give the general development, general education; c) teach some craft, which in the given area would be of significant value in the development of the productive forces of the homeland; g) to develop aesthetic and public senses by organizing clubs, choirs, theaters.

The curriculum included not only general educational subjects (reading and writing, arithmetic, natural history, accounting), but special subjects – shoemaking, tailoring, carpentry, metalwork, blacksmithing, and also subjects such as singing, drawing, study of

dramatic works. There were also subjects aimed at the introduction of the Marxist-Leninist ideology. The Kyrgyz Revolutionary Committee with the Department of People Education worked out an instruction on the elimination of illiteracy in the region in 1920. At the same time The Kyrgyz Revolutionary Committee issued a decree on measures of the elimination of illiteracy in the province. Thanks to such measures only in 1920-1921, 72 thousand people learned to read and write[68].

In the subsequent period because of famine the number of the trained illiterates decreased sharply. Only in 1924-1925, there was observed the rise of elimination of illiteracy work. During this period, was created a branch of the All-Union society «Down with Illiteracy», which was able to open about 882 elimination of illiteracy points. Of course, accustoming wide strata of population to the alphabetic illiteracy is one of the positive outcomes of the culture construction in Kazakhstan. Thus, the all-Union census of 1939 fixed literacy of the population in Kazakhstan at the level of 61.4% (the literacy of the Kazakh population was 54.5%, and Russian - 70.4%)[69]. But at the same time, it should be taken into account that during this period one and the same man had to teach elementary reading and writing three times since at the end of the 1920s, the Kazakh written language was transferred from the Arabic script into the Latin alphabet, and in the late 19230's from Latin to the Cyrillic alphabet. In addition, all the work on elimination of illiteracy disorganized with terrible famine of 1931-1933. Besides elimination of illiteracy radical transformation of social relations, establishment of an entirely new ideology demanded radical measures on changing consciousness and spiritual world of the people. The Bolsheviks well understood that only with some measures in the field of education it was impossible to change people's minds, to Teach to think in terms of the Marxism-Leninism. In the base of transformations in the sphere of culture underlay ideological motives. Propaganda and agitation was carried out

[68] See.: Istoriya Kazahstana s drevnejshih vremen do nashih dnej v pyati tomah. T. 4. – Almaty: Atamura, 2010. – P. 399.

[69] See: Istoriya Kazahstana s drevnejshih vremen do nashih dnej v pyati tomah. T. 4. – Almaty: Atamura, 2010. – C. 401.

systematically and orderly. For example, in Kazakhstan everywhere was created network of cultural and educational institutions – clubs, libraries, museums, reading rooms. Adult education institutions were created not chaotically but taking into account the economic structure and the ethnic and demographic situation in the province. In multi-ethnic areas were create libraries, reading rooms and clubs for the Russians, Kazakhs and other ethnic groups. In the nomadic and semi-nomadic regions used red tent, mobile libraries, and Red caravans. They moved from aul to aul. In them cultural and educational work was combined with medical service and other measures. Despite the cultural orientation of the out of-school institutions system should be borne in mind that basically it had a deep ideological character. However, during the famine of 1921 cultural centers were involved in the fight against hunger. For example, the Glavpolitprosvet organized three exhibitions. They were made up of pictures taken along the Tashkent railway. In addition to photographs were exhibited posters, which in figures illustrated the dimensions of the famine. One exhibition was shown in Moscow at the IX All-Russian Congress of Soviets in December 1921, and after the Congress was sent to Germany. The second exhibition was shown in Orenburg and Semipalatinsk, and some of its exhibits were sent to America. The third exhibition was shown in Tashkent. Besides exhibitions the Glavpolitprosvet organized a week of help for the starving people, issued leaflets about the famine, made a radio appeal to the starving. But in the years of the forcible collectivization and famine, as well as during the Great Terror all clubs and libraries were busy with praising the collective farm system, struggle with saboteurs, and did not pay any attention to famine. Thus, in the 1930's. Cultural and educational institutions became formal bodies and the ideological and political tool of the mass processing. The main and the most tangible result of the Cultural Revolution was the establishment of a new school system. Although measures on organizing the school network were taken at the end of 1917-1918, by the end of the 1920 s became apparent unsettledness of school education problems. For example, in 1929 only 40% of school-age children attended schools of the first stage. At the same time, the lowest rates were among the Kazakh and

Uzbek children – 21%. In August 1930, it was adopted a Decision on the introduction of universal compulsory elementary education. By the end of 1930, the implementation of universal primary education had been practically completed. By 1937, the rate of children enrollment in primary education had reached 96%. In addition to the positive results the school education implementation had also another side. Having solved the problem of knowledge dissemination of, the Bolsheviks distorted the content side as they regarded the party and class principle of paramount importance. The totalitarian regime transformed schools into a tool of educating an obedient and ideologized generation. The content of textbooks, activities the Komsomol and Pioneer organizations were focused on the introduction of Stalinist dogmas into the consciousness of pupils, blind faith in the policies and ideology of the party. Besides, it was the time of the terrible famine of 1931-1933, repressions against the Kazakh national intelligentsia. However, for a quarter of a century of Soviet power in Kazakhstan had been established a qualitatively new system of public education. There also was created a network of schools, pre-school and out-of-school institutions, vocational training schools, schools, factory-and-works seven-year schools. In addition, during this period there also appeared a higher education in Kazakhstan. In 1928, was opened a University with a teaching faculty. In the three departments of the Faculty 124 students were taught, 9 teachers worked. In 1930/1931, the University was transformed into the Abai Kazakh Pedagogical Institute, Almaty Veterinary (1929), Kazakh Agricultural (1930), Medical (1931), Ural Pedagogical (1932), the S. Kirov Kazakh State University (1934). On the eve of the war there were already 20 higher, 118 secondary specialized schools, 40 thousands of students in Kazakhstan. A characteristic feature of the Kazakhstan science development in the 1920's. became predominant developing local history and humanities researches. In this period had been published fundamental works on history, literature, language and arts. In the period 1920-1924, the Society for the Study of Kazakhstan published seven editions of the works in which M.Dulatov were published, scientific papers of A. Ryazanov, M. Tynyshpayev, A.Chuloshnikov. Book by A. Zataevich «1000 songs of the Kazakh people» in 1925 won international

recognition. A major contribution to the formation of literature and linguistics, made A. Baitursynov. In his books in 1926 and 1928 were worked out problems of phonetics, morphology and grammar of the Kazakh language, theory and history of Kazakh literature. In the 1920 s Zh. Aymautov published a number of works on pedagogy and psychology, T. Ryskulov, S.Asfendiyarov, S. Sadvakasov – on history of Kazakhstan and Central Asia. During this period, Russian scientists provided assistance to the Kazakh science. On the territory of Kazakhstan worked numerous expeditions for studying the entrails of the earth, flora and fauna, anthropology and ethnography of the Kazakh people. For example, the Kazakhstan and Altai expedition of the Special Committee on studying the Union and Autonomous Republics (in which participated A. Margulan – a student of the Leningrad Institute of Oriental Studies). Great contribution on soil-biological survey of the western regions of Kazakhstan made a scientific expedition of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR headed by Professor S. Neustroev. Expanding the network of scientific institutions and scope of scientific works allowed Kazakhstan to organize the base of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, headed by Academician A. Samoylovych. In the structure of the Kazakh base of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR were such sectors as the botanical, zoological, geographical, field research commission, historical and archaeological Commission, Commission for the dictionary. In 1938, Kazakhstan's base was transformed into the Kazakh branch of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, within which were developed such sciences as historical, linguistic, geological and chemical. Professor S. Asfendiyarov wrote his monograph on the history of the national liberation movements, the first volume of generalized work on history of Kazakhstan from ancient times. In the field of linguistics professor K Zhubanov successfully worked. He developed complex problems of phonetics, morphology, etymology, onomastics, grammar, syntax, literary Kazakh language and also the Kazakh language history. In the 1930 s, K.I. Satpayev did rise to the heights of science. With his active participation began prospecting for and developing the wealth of Dzhezkazgan. In the pre-war period the Soviet government took the lead in developing of literature and arts. The Soviet government

conducted a hard line in relation to artistic culture. During this period, as all over the country in Kazakhstan were destroyed or used in household and cultural purposes mosques, churches and other religious and confessional structures. For of a quarter century of socialist building in Kazakhstan arose a qualitatively new Kazakh literature. It differed from the old literature on the content ideological and artistic principles. It was based on the principle of socialist realism. At the same time the creative work of writers, faithful to the principles of socialist realism, for example, S. Seifullin flourished. In 1920-1930-s in the process of formation of the Kazakh literature contributed I. Zhansugurov, B. Mailin, M. Auezov. To the literary movement joined S. Mukanov, G. Musrepov, G.Mustafin, I. Shuhov. In keeping with the traditional oral literature worked Zh.Baiganin, K. Azerbaev, I. Baizakov. Omar, Doskei, Kalka, Kuat, Umbetali, Sayadil followed in Zh. Zhabaev's step. Their creative work made a whole page of the Kazakh people cultural history. During this period dramatic art gets its development. As long ago as 1918-1920s their artistic activities bagan began E.Umirzakov, K. Badyrov, I. Baizakov, K. Zhandarbekov – the founders of theatrical art in Kazakhstan. In 1925 the Kazakh National Theatre was established. In January 1926 the grand opening of the Kazakh professional theater took place. The first performance was a fragment from M. Auezov' drama «Enlik-Qébec». Director and actor Zh. Shanin did a lot in the formation of the theatrical culture. Dramatic art achieved greater success in the 1930s. During this period, there appeared professional theaters in the regions, and also theaters of other peoples of Kazakhstan (Russian Drama Theatre, 1934, Uighur National Theatre, 1938). O the theater stages were put works of M. Auezov, G.Musrepov, A. Abishev, Sh.Husainov, I. Sattarov, A. Sadyrov, as well as world classics work («The Inspector General» by Gogol, «Othello» by Shakespeare). During this period also developed musical culture. In 1925 the singer A. Kashaubaev participated in the ethnographic concert at the World Exhibition in Paris. He performed songs «Agash Ayak», «Dudarai», «Kara Torgai», «Kyzyl biday». Performance of the Kazakh singer was praised in the French press. In 1927 A. Kashaubaev successfully sang at the World Music Exhibition in Frankfurt am Main. After the Exhibition, he made a

long tour in the cities of Germany. Thus, having considered the Bolsheviks policy on the introduction of Soviet culture and cultural standards to the masses, we see the dual nature of the consequences for the future of the Kazakh people. On the one hand, we see the development of a state educational system and mass literacy campaigns in rural areas, which certainly had a positive character for the future of the nation. The undoubted achievements in the development of culture of Kazakhstan in the pre-war period, do not allow us to agree with the conclusions of some authors that the Soviet cultural policy in Kazakhstan as destructive and oppressive. On the other hand, the Soviet government imposed all «Soviet ways of being modern», identification with the Soviet culture, what had as a consequence of a denial of Kazakh «national culture».

Control questions:

1. Prove that the establishment of a new school education system was the main achievement of the Bolsheviks in the building new culture in Kazakhstan.
2. Show main methods of familiarizing of the Kazakhs with Soviet standards of culture?
3. Prove that Soviet power conducted a tough policy concerning artistic culture (all over the country).
4. How did the Kazakh written language develop in the pre-war period
5. What two aims did the Bolsheviks pursue while conducting cultural modernization of the country? What were the peculiarities of implementing this policy in Kazakhstan?

6.2. Kazakhstan during the Great Patriotic War, 1941-1945 and Post-War period, 1946-1953

6.2.1. Memory about the Great Patriotic War, 1941-1945 in the Contemporary post-Soviet states

In this chapter, I would like to stress that while in many countries of the post-Soviet space is going rewriting the period of the Great Patriotic War, in Kazakh historiography this theme was written as part of the Soviet discourse. This is evidenced by chapter eighth «Kazakhstan in the Great Patriotic War (1941-1945.)» in the fourth volume of the academic history of Kazakhstan. The most radical is in

this respect the historical memory in the Baltic States and in the Western Ukraine. For example, in Latvia it is considered that the Republic of Latvia was first occupied by the Soviet Union, then Germany. At the same time the Germans occupation period is considered as a much softer and even productive for the country. And with the Soviet Union, they connect only tangible losses: demographic, economic, social. In the Latvian historiography completely revised activities «of the Latvian Waffen SS Volunteer Legion». They believe that the Waffen SS did not fight for Nazi Germany, but for independent Latvia. As long ago as in the 1990s the Latvian Saeima adopted a declaration «On the Latvian Waffen SS Legion», which states that – he legionaries – heroes and the task of the state – to protect them and fight for the honor of the unit. This view of the official historiography is widely circulated in the public space. For example, in the War Museum of Latvia is exhibited Alexander Plensner's full-dress unifrom – a collaborator, standartenfuehrer SS, presented as «a fighter for freedom», of the Republic of Latvia. In Estonia, one can observe the same picture.

Such a way describes the modern textbook «History of Estoni» by A. Adamson and S. Valdma the Estonians sentiments in connection with the occupation of the Republic by Germany: «Most Estonians greeted the Germans as liberators. In the wake of the initial enthusiasm 55,000 people entered the «Omakaitse», the police or by eastern police battalions created by the German command. The latter were used on the Russian territory occupied by Germans for restoring order in the rear, anti-guerrilla actions – and eventually directly in the front. Estonian and Latvian volunteer battalions often had higher fighting spirit than the Wehrmacht units, although they were worse armed»[70].

Rewriting the history of the Second World War took place in the Ukraine. In the official historical memory the authorities are trying to enter this period of history in the European context. This is indicated by the celebration of a tradition in the public space in the European spirit of remembrance and reconciliation. So, today the Ukraine is celebrating in May two holidays- the 9 of May as the Victory Day

[70] Prazdnovanie okonchaniya Vtoroj mirovoj vojny v baltijskih stranah. Available at: http://inonewsru.livejournal.com/10184.html. Дата последнего обращения 22 апреля 2016 г.

over Nazism in Europe and the 8 of May as the Day of Remembrance and Reconciliation, as the Victory Day in Europe is celebrated annually on the May 8. Because in this day of 1945 late in the evening, a successor of Adolf Hitler (who at that time had already committed suicide) German President Karl Doenitz signed the capitulation of Nazi Germany. Formally, in this day the war in Europe ended[71].

In the Ukrainian official historical narrative this page is inscribed on the basis of the discourse of loss and suffering: «In World War II the Ukrainians suffered casualties more than the United Kingdom, Canada, the United States and France put together. Total losses of the Ukraine in the war are estimated at 8-10 million lives. The number of the Ukrainian victims is comparable with the population of modern Austria. The Ukrainians of Transcarpathia were the first in the interwar Europe who do not put up with the annexation of its territory. With weapons in hand, they came to the defense of their freedom from aggression in March 1939. From the very September 1st, 1939 Luftwaffe planes bombed Galicia and Volyn. During World War II, fighting actions twice swept across the Ukraine. Kharkiv, one of the largest cities in the Ukraine, passed from hands to hands four times. Ukrainians have become cannon fodder, for two dictators – Hitler and Stalin. The Red Army lost one third (compared with every 20 th in the British Army). The reason for this terrible situation was simple – Stalin was not considered with any losses, based on the logic of «Women will give some more birth!» The consequence of the collision between two totalitarian regimes became unprecedented victims among both military men and civilian population; the territory between the Carpathians and the Don became a bloody land. Such was the price for the Ukrainians because of the lack of their own independent state. The Ukrainians fought against Hitler and his allies in the armies of Poland and the Soviet Union, Canada, France, the United States and Czechoslovakia, on the fronts of Europe, North Africa and South-East Asia, the

[71] Ukraina vpervye oficial'no nachinaet novuyu tradiciyu otmechaniya 8 i 9 maya v evropejskom duhe pamyati i primireniya. Available at: http://ru.tsn.ua/politika/segodnya-ukraina-otmechaet-den-pamyati-i-primireniya-pochemu-8-maya-i-chto-oznachaet-krasnyy-mak-424512.html.

Pacific and Atlantic oceans. The Ukrainian Alexei Berest was one of those who established the Soviet flag over the Reichstag in Berlin, while the Ukrainian Michael Strank – one of the six Marines who raised the US flag over Iwo Jima (Japan). But only the Ukrainian Insurgent Army acted in the war under the Ukrainian national flag»[72].

But Today there remains a great deal of misunderstanding, conflict, and revision concerning the Ukrainian involvement in the Second World War. The Ukrainian people are themselves unclear as to the true nature of their involvement within the war, the issues that influenced their behaviour, and finally the repercussions it holds today. Individual Ukrainians served in units of the Red Army, its partisan units, the Wehrmacht, as well as acting independently in paramilitary groups supporting nationalist movements. The activities of the Ukrainians during the Second World War, especially the organized resistance movements of the OUN (Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists) and UPA (Ukrainian Insurgent Army) do not conform to any sort of traditional collaboration or resistance paradigm and can only be understood when viewed through the lens of nationalist ambitions. The conflict that currently exists within the Ukraine over the memories of the Second World War and the role of their ethnic brethren is reflective of the political division that the newly established post Soviet state is grappling with. One issue facing Ukrainian historians is how to deal with the Second World War when some Ukrainians were supporting Soviet partisans and actively combating anti-Soviet Ukrainian nationalists who conversely were sometimes cooperating with Nazi occupation forces. There has been an increased emphasis placed by the current historiography coming from within Ukraine on developing a modified version of the Second World War myth focused primarily on liberation from Nazi occupation. Currently within the Ukraine, historians have become inclined to focus on the events within western Ukraine and the nationalist's resistance to Nazi occupation in support of creating a

[72] Conflicting memories- Ukrainians and the Second World war – an Examination of the Current State in Historiographical Debate. [Электронный ресурс]. Режим доступа: https://www.academia.edu/4230537/Conflicting_Memories_Ukrainians_and_the_Second_World_War_-_An_Examination_of_the_Current_State_of_Historiographical_Debate.

national history. However, reception of these efforts have met with resistance in western the Ukraine because liberation from Nazi occupation also carried with it reoccupation by the Soviets. In turn, in eastern the Ukraine anti-Soviet sentiment is less welcomed, and the UPA especially are viewed in a negative light for their anti-Soviet activities. «The Ukrainians carried at least 40% of losses of the USSR in WWII. The Soviet historiographical concept of the «Great Patriotic War», however, employed major misperceptions of the Ukrainians' role and is now being used as a propaganda instrument fueling the war in Donbas. In our series «Understanding the Ukrainians in WWII» we seek to uncover the underreported role of the Ukrainians living both in Ukraine and abroad in the most deadly war of the 20th century»[73].

In the historical narrative of modern Uzbekistan we do not see a radical rewriting of the war pages. There is only a tendency of incorporating it in the context of the world history. Thus, the author of the article «Uzbekistan's contribution to the victory in World War II», writes: «I am bursting with pride, realizing that my homeland – Uzbekistan, along with the former republics of the Soviet Union Russia, Kazakhstan, Azerbaijan, etc. contributed to this truly global and the great victory, without which there would not be anything it is nice to realize themselves as a part of the great history»[74].

In June 22, 1941, Nazi Germany attacked the Soviet Union in a short time the Nazis seized the Baltic countries (which not long ago had been annexed to the Soviet Union), the Ukraine and Belarus. All this led to the evacuation inland to the east large, important, necessary at the front the industrial enterprises in particular Uzbekistan (Uzbek SSR). There were evacuated more than 100 enterprises (the Leningrad factory of textile machinery, Rostselmash, Sumy Compressor Plant, and many others) so in Tashkent and the

[73] Conflicting memories- Ukrainians and the Second World war – an Examination of the Current State in Historiographical Debate. Available at: https://www.academia.edu/4230537/Conflicting_Memories_Ukrainians_and_the_Second_World_War_-_An_Examination_of_the_Current_State_of_Historiographical_Debate.

[74] Vklad Uzbekistana v pobedu vo vtoroj mirovoj vojne. Available at: http://vsemirnaya-istoriya.ru/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=74:vklad-uzbekistana&catid=7:totalitarniy-period&Itemid=2.

Tashkent region were placed 55 enterprises, in Samarkand – 14, the Fergana valley-22, Bukhara – 2, thousands of workers were also evacuated The situation was very heavy, the front badly needed weapons (shooting), ammunition, aircraft, tanks, and so on. It was necessary urgently to start up enterprises plants very often started to work without a roof i.e., they were placed in the open sky, it was later when emerged full-fledged buildings and rooms; the war endured no stay, it was necessary as soon as possible to involve industry and we could have one it. Because of the shortage of men as many of them were taken to the front in the factories were working women, children, the elderly such picture was observed all over the country and 26 June 1941 was defined 13 hour working day and 6 day working week and for being late or leaving working place without permission were given from 5 to 8 years[75]. A similar trend of conservation of the Soviet discourse in the story of the war we have seen in the Belarusian narrative «Among the 34.4 million Soviet soldiers who participated in the fighting on the fronts of the Great Patriotic War, were more than 1.3 million – Belarusians and natives of Belarus. In Belarus The Great Patriotic War (June 22, 1941-9 May 1945) lasted 3 years 1 month and 6 days - from June 22, 1941 to July 28, 1944. Nazi-occupied Belarus was the country where the largest in Europe unfolded partisan and underground movement. Against invaders fought over 374 thousand partisans, more than 70 thousand participants numbered antifascist underground. During World War II the largest urban anti-fascist underground in Europe acted in Belarusian Minsk. 209 of the 270 cities on the Belarusian land was plundered and destroyed. The Nazis held in Belarus over 140 punitive operations, fully or partially destroyed 5454 villages. After the end of that terrible war Belarus for many years recovered from the ravages and losses. And till now the country piously reveres the memory of victims of fascism, the heroism and courage of people who lived in difficult times and gave up, everything to bring the long-awaited Victory Day. However, in spite of the heroic resistance of the

[75] Vklad Uzbekistana v pobedu vo vtoroj mirovoj vojne. Available at: http://vsemirnaya-istoriya.ru/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=74:vklad-uzbekistana&catid=7:totalitarniy-period&Itemid=2.

people Belarus, being on the way of Nazi Germany army sustained during the war irreplaceable losses»[76].

Thus, we see that on the post- Soviet space there are different discourses of memory on the participation in the Great Patriotic War – from the modern discourse of Eastern European countries equating the political regime of the USSR to the regime of Nazi Germany to the old Soviet, emphasizing the role of the USSR in defeating the Nazis.

6.2.2 .The Soviet Massive Deportations to Kazakhstan

Joseph Stalin's forcible resettlement of over 1.5 million people, mostly Muslims, during and after World War II is now viewed as one of his most drastic genocidal acts[77]. Volga Germans and seven nationalities of Crimea and the northern Caucasus were deported: the Crimean Tatars, Kalmyks, Chechens, Ingush, Balkars, Karachai, and Meskhetians. Other minorities evicted from the Black Sea coastal region included Bulgarians, Greeks, and Armenians.

Resistance to Soviet rule, separatism, and widespread collaboration with the German occupation forces were among the official reasons for the deportation of these non-Russian peoples. The possibility of a German attack was used to justify the resettlement of the ethnically mixed population of Miskheta, in southwestern Georgia. The Balkars were punished for allegedly having sent a white horse as a gift to Adolf Hitler. The deportees were rounded up and transported, usually in railroad cattle cars, to Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan, Kirgizia, and Siberia – areas called «human dumping grounds» by historian Robert Conquest. Most estimates indicate that close to two-fifths of the affected populations perished. Between 1935 and 1936, ethnic minorities who lived in the Soviet Western border regions were deported. The victims were Germans and Poles who inhabited the western part of Ukraine. Poland's eastern border, as stipulated by the treaty of Riga which brought closure to the Polish-Bolshevik war of 1920, left substantial Polish minorities on

[76] Great Patriotic War in Belarus. Available at: http://www.belarus.by/en/travel/military-history-tourism/great-patriotic-war-in-belarus.

[77] Revelations from the Russian Archives. DEPORTATIONS. 2010. Library of Congress. Accessed April 27. https://www.loc.gov/exhibits/archives/depo.html.

the Soviet side of the border. In 1935 about 1,800 German and Polish families first were moved into the eastern part of Ukraine but, in 1936, 15,000 German and Polish families were finally deported to Kazakhstan in Central Asia.1936, April: About 35,700 Poles living alongside the Ukrainian frontier and some 20,000 Finnish peasants were deported to Kazakhstan for the same reasons as those previously mentioned. The deportation was class-based in the sense that it targeted specific economic categories; but it was also ethnically motivated, as it aimed to secure the frontiers[78]. The first large-scale operation of massive deportation occurred in the Soviet Far East. NKVD order No. 00447 issued on 30 July divided the groups of antiSoviet elements into two categories: executed or deported. Even though national contingents were included in the target of the operation, this did not mean from the beginning the removal of the whole population of the suspected nationalities from the Far Eastern border regions. Also, until July, no documents suggested that the whole population of Koreans would be deported to Central Asia. Nonetheless, the decree on the Koreans' deportation was issued on 21 August 1937. From then until December of that year, all Koreans living in the Far East were removed from that area. As in the Western border case, the deepened conflicts between Russia and Japan in the Far East finally led to the mass deportation of not only Koreans, but Germans, Poles, and Chinese. Among them, Koreans constituted 90 percent of total deportees from this area. According to the official record offered by the government, between September and December of 1937, 172,481 Koreans were deported, while 2,500 were arrested and sent to labor camps or were shot. The deportation was swiftly implemented, and between September and November of 1937, 172,481 Koreans were deported. What factors caused the deportation of the Koreans? The answer lies in the essence of the Stalinist state. The Korean issue was not isolated from other incidents but was organically connected with them. Therefore, the Koreans' deportation must be analyzed within the framework of

[78] Aurélie Campana, The Soviet Massive Deportations - A Chronology, Online Encyclopedia of Mass Violence, [online], published on 5 November 2007, accessed 21 May 2016, URL : http://www.massviolence.org/The-Soviet-massive-deportations-A-chronology, ISSN 1961-9898.

the Soviet politics. Scholars have discussed several causes as major factors in the deportation of Koreans to Central Asia: Soviet distrust of Koreans, preemptive measures against Japan's use of Koreans as spies, and economic interest, such as the spread of rice farming to Central Asia.

So about 173,000 Koreans living along the Chinese and Korean borders were relocated by force to Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan. After a brutal expulsion, the Koreans experienced severe living conditions. Moscow did not inform the local Uzbek and Kazakh authorities about the arrival of a large population of «administrative settlers.» Nothing was prepared to accommodate or provide them with basic supplies such as food, clothes and shoes. Although there was no reliable data regarding the Korean death toll, testimonies and NKVD documents indicate that many of them died from disease, starvation and lack of housing. By 1945, they joined the long list of «special settlers,» among other punished peoples[79].

The cause of the deportation was that the Soviet government feared Germany's expanded influence on Soviet Germans. Finally, the increased tension between Germany and the Soviet Union in the Western border regions and the Soviet regime's excessive anxiety over Germany forced the Soviet government to take irreversible measures. While in the Soviet Western border regions Germany posed a threat to the Soviet regime, in the Soviet Far Eastern border regions Japan's aggressive expansionism threatened the security of the Soviet Union. Japan's attack on Manchuria in 1931 and the establishment of Manchukuo, its puppet government, in 1932 was understood by the Soviet government as Japan's plan to eventually target the Soviet Union to wage war[80].

In 1941, all the colonists from the Volga region were deported by Stalin's Soviet government to Siberia, Kazakhstan, and other remote regions because of their German heritage. The formal decree

[79] Lee, Woosung (2012). The Koreans' migration to the Russian far East and their deportations to Central Asia: from the 1860s to 1937 (Master's thesis, the Russian, East European, and Eurasian Studies Program and the Graduate School of the University of Oregon, USA). Retrieved from https://scholarsbank.uoregon.edu/xmlui/bitstream/handle/1794/12388/Lee_oregon_0171N_10377.pdf?sequence=1.

[80] Revelations from the Russian Archives. Deportations. Avaiable at: https://www.loc.gov/exhibits/archives/depo.html.

came on 28 August 1941 which abolished the Autonomous Socialistic Soviet Republic of the Volga Germans. On 1 September 1941 mass evacuation was announced for the approximately 440,000 Volga Germans. Ten days later they began their forced deportation to Kazakhstan and Siberia. Many were forced to work in the Trudarmee (labor army) in camps such as Kolyma. The Volga Germans were then stripped of their citizenship and did not regain their civil rights until after Stalin's death. The Volga Germans were now treated as prisoners and were transported by rail to the camps. There were 151 train convoys departing from 19 stations. Some 20,000 NKVD troops and the huge quantities of rolling stock and other resources were diverted from the war effort in order to shift vast numbers of old people, women and children to distant lands quite unprepared to receive them. Fifty or 60 people were packed into each freight car and given water only when the train stopped every three or four days. Food, when provided, was generally salted herring which only made the prisoners' thirst that much greater. The journey could take many weeks. The consequences were devastating. Some families were given as little as five or ten minutes to pack up their belongings and food for the trip. No food was supplied. Tens of thousands are believed to have died during journeys which lasted up to two months. In some cases, bodies were left in the overcrowded cattle wagons for weeks on end. In others, they were thrown out beside the tracks. Most estimates indicate that close to 40 percent of the affected population perished. Many of the transfers took place in fall and winter months. Those who survived the journey often found themselves with inadequate clothing, no shelter, and no means to support themselves in temperatures as low as -40ºC in Siberia. Their movement was restricted to a limited zone always a few kilometers short of the nearest town. By 1989, nearly a million Russian-Germans lived in Kazakhstan. They constituted the third largest nationality in the territory after Russians and Kazakhs. At almost 6% of the population, the Russian-Germans formed the largest and most important diaspora nationality in the Kazakh SSR. The Russian-Germans played an important role in Kazakhstan's economic development in the years after World War II. The origins of the Russian-Germans in Kazakhstan are mixed. Russian-German

colonists from other regions of the Russian Empire first settled there in 1882. By 1926, Kazakhstan had over 50,000 Russian-Germans. Deportations during the collectivization of agriculture in 1930-1931 further increased this population. In 1936, the Soviet government exiled the Russian-German population near the Polish border to Kazakhstan. The vast majority of Russian-Germans from Kazakhstan are the descendents of deportees during World War II. During the fall of 1941, the Stalin regime deported more than 850,000 Russian-Germans eastward. Close to 400,000 of these deportees ended up in Kazakhstan. Here the Soviet government subjected them to inhumane living conditions of severe material poverty and denial of basic human rights. Only in the mid-1950s, after Stalin's death, did their status improve significantly. Despite these improvements, the Russian-Germans continued to suffer from official discrimination. They could not return to their former places of residence, they only had access to a few token German language publications and they remained largely excluded from receiving higher education and white collar jobs. With the dismantling of the Soviet Union in 1991 and the creation of an independent Kazakhstan, the ethnic Germans began a mass exodous from the region – back into Russia proper and to Germany. By 1999, the German population in Kazakhstan numbered only 353,441[81].

1943, October 12: The Supreme Soviet issued a decree ordering the deportation of all the Karachays and Balkars[82], a Turkish-speaking people inhabiting the North Caucasus. The USSR accused them of collaboration with the German army, which had been occupying Karachay territory for the previous six months. In November 68,938 persons, mainly disarmed (women, children, elderly people

[81] Deportation (1941). The center for Volga-German studies at Concordia University. [online], published on 2 July 2011, accessed 6 May 2016, URL: http://cvgs.cu-portland.edu/history/Deportation.cfm.

[82] The Balkars and Karachay are Turkik people who arrived and settled in Central Caucasus around the XII century. Although having their own Turkik languages, they adapted to local Caucasian culture – dressing, dance, customs; also, values like hospitality and honor, prevalent throughout the Caucasus, are essential part of Karachay-Balkar culture. Karachay-Balkar language is divided in 2 dialects: Karachay-Baksan-Chegem and Balkar. The Kumyks, their ethnic cousins who speak the same language live in today's Dagestan. The Balkars live in Kabardino-Balkaria republic, mostly in the high mountainous regions which are also some of the highest in the world. The Karachay live in neighboring Karachay-Cherkessia, at the foothills of the Caucasus mountains. The Karachays and Balkars are followers of Islam.

and war veterans) were transported under very hard conditions to Kirghizia and Kazakhstan. The men serving with the Red Army or fighting in partisan movements were demobilized and sent into exile or to labor camps. All the Karachays paid for the relationship that a few of their fellow Karachays had established with the German occupiers. This scenario became a common one for all punished peoples. Like all other deportees, many perished due to unbearable conditions (cold, starvation, hard labor, lack of medical help etc). The survivors were allowed to return in 1957 after Stalin's death[83].

1944, February 23: The Soviet government deported the Chechens and the Ingush, two Muslim peoples of the North Caucasus. Although the Germans had only occupied a region in the extreme northwest of the Republic, Chechens and Ingush were accused of betrayal and massive collaboration with the German occupiers, like the other punished peoples. Beria's administration used methods resembling those of earlier deportations. Yet this operation proved to be more difficult due to the uneven nature of the terrain. Furthermore, the resistance of a few Chechen and Ingush groups slowed down the NKVD soldiers' agenda. Nonetheless, in seven days nearly 478,000 people, comprised of 387,000 Chechens and 91,000 Ingush, were arrested, loaded into hundreds of convoys and then resettled in Central Asia, mainly in Kazakhstan. It is difficult to set an exact death toll due to the lack of evidence. According to different estimations, between 30% and 50% of the deportees died, either during the journey or in the first years of exile in the special settlements[84].

The Chechen-Ingush massive deportation was well-prepared. It occurred during the Second World War, while the Red Army engaged in hard fighting against Germany, suffered heavy losses and material shortages. Yet, about 120,000 NKVD soldiers were in the

[83] Aurélie Campana, The Soviet Massive Deportations – A Chronology, Online Encyclopedia of Mass Violence, [online], published on 5 November 2007, accessed 23 May 2016, URL: http://www.massviolence.org/The-Soviet-massive-deportations-A-chronology, ISSN 1961-9898.

[84] Aurélie Campana, The Massive Deportation of the Chechen People: How and why Chechens were Deported, Online Encyclopedia of Mass Violence, [online], published on 5 November 2007, accessed 23 May 2016, URL : http://www.massviolence.org/The-Massive-Deportation-of-the-Chechen-People-How-and-why, ISSN 1961-9898.

Republic at the time and participated in the forced resettlement. The NKVD commandant, Lavrenti Beria, personally supervised the operation. On February 17, 1944, Beria arrived in the capital city of Groznyy. He regularly reported to Stalin on the progress made by his armed forces. The correspondence, which records each step of the deportation in its preparation and realization, attests to the highest central authorities' involvement. The People's Commissariat for Internal Affairs (NKVD), predecessor to the Committee for State Security (KGB), was in charge of the operation. In eight days, the NKVD forcefully deported 350,000 to 400,000 Chechens and 91,250 Ingush. Official documents vary on the precise figure deported and the exact Chechen population figure. Therefore, some doubt remains regarding the exact number of the Chechen deportees. More importantly, the Chechen deportation was longer and more difficult than the earlier deportations in the Northern Caucasus. Both, the uneven nature of the terrain and the Chechens who hid in the mountains to resist the NKVD soldiers slowed down this operation[85].

The Chechen deportation had a lot in common with other massive deportations carried out by the Stalinist regime. The deportation occurred during the Second World War, right after the Red Army reconquered the territories occupied by the German army. The Stalinist regime fallaciously accused the Chechens (and the Ingush) of massive collaboration with the German invaders, and then deported them en masse on February 23, 1944. The Chechens were scattered throughout the entire Soviet Union territory and became «special settlers». In the official Soviet terminology this term refers to a particular category of people forcibly removed from their natal territory, for economic, ethnic or religious purpose, and deprived of any constitutional or collective rights.

Although they represent two distinct ethnic groups, Chechens (a Muslim North Caucasian people) and the Ingushs are ethnically related and often compared. In 1934, the Soviet government artificially merged these two groups into one political-administrative

[85] Aurélie Campana, The Massive Deportation of the Chechen People: How and why Chechens were Deported, Online Encyclopedia of Mass Violence, [online], published on 5 November 2007, accessed 23 May 2016, URL : http://www.massviolence.org/The-Massive-Deportation-of-the-Chechen-People-How-and-why, ISSN 1961-9898.

entity: the Autonomous Chechen-Ingush Region, which became an Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic (ASSR) in 1936. Chechens represented up to 50% of the total population of the Chechen-Ingush ASSR. An overwhelming majority of them lived in rural zones and followed traditional ways of life.

Chechens remained impervious to the numerous attempts to Sovietize them. Their clan-system was quite strong and governed the main social aspects of life. The Communist Party had little influence given that religious leaders and elders retained their social positions. The traditional and the Soviet systems were superimposed one onto the other, and most of Moscow's decisions gave rise to resistance and revolts. Thus, Chechens met the Soviet authorities with strong opposition when they imposed brutal collectivization tactics. Several uprisings occurred in the Republic during the 1930s. Likewise, the war aggravated this very complex situation. A part of the Chechen population was openly hostile towards Soviet rule. Some tried to make contact with the Germans, as Ukrainians or Russians had done. A few of the insurgent groups' leaders viewed Germany's advance as an opportunity to gain autonomy or even independence. However, the Germans refused to accede to their demands, and Chechens consequently cut off all discussions[86].

However, this does not mean that the Chechens massively collaborated with the Germans. The 1943-1944 official documents disclose quite the contrary. These documents assess the local population's role in stopping the German advance and resistance to the invaders, who occupied during approximately twelve weeks the North-West of the Republic In fact, many Chechen men served in the Red Army or took an active part in partisan movements[87].

Notwithstanding the evidence of contribution to the war effort, the Soviets accused the Chechens of cooperating with the enemy and subsequently condemned them to deportation. Central authorities,

[86] Aurélie Campana, The Massive Deportation of the Chechen People: How and why Chechens were Deported, Online Encyclopedia of Mass Violence, [online], published on 5 November 2007, accessed 6 May 2016, URL : http://www.massviolence.org/The-Massive-Deportation-of-the-Chechen-People-How-and-why, ISSN 1961-9898.

[87] Aurélie Campana, The Massive Deportation of the Chechen People: How and why Chechens were Deported, Online Encyclopedia of Mass Violence, [online], published on 5 November 2007, accessed 23 May 2016, URL : http://www.massviolence.org/The-Massive-Deportation-of-the-Chechen-People-How-and-why, ISSN 1961-9898.

more particularly Stalin and his entourage, were indisputably responsible for the Chechen deportation. The poor conditions in their new settlements, the general indifference regarding living conditions, and the NKVD's harsh rule contributed to decimation of the deportees. Local authorities were notified at the last-minute, if they were informed at all, about the arrival of large groups of special settlers. Meaning that, local authorities had neither the time, nor the means, to prepare for such an influx of people arriving in exceedingly poor physical and moral condition due to the grueling journey. In most regions, nothing was prepared to accommodate the deportees. Thus, the local administration was unable to supply the newcomers with even the most basic necessities. The NKVD, accountable only to itself, was undoubtedly responsible for the lack of organization, indifference and violence used during the expulsion itself and in the exile-destinations. Under the NKVD strict rules, the Chechens endured very hard conditions during their thirteen years of a forced exile. They were widely dispersed, and placed in special settlements. Although the camps were not surrounded by barbwire, deportees were nonetheless subjected to special regulations. For instance, Chechens were not allowed to leave their villages beyond a three or five kilometer perimeter, and each month or even every fifteen days, they had to register with the local NKVD office (spetskomandatur). Moreover, the NKVD obliged them to work in sovkhoze, kolkhoze or a factory where they received poor salaries for hard physical labor. Chechens were also forbidden to use their own language, and the children who went to school attended Russian primary school. After three very difficult years, the survivors settled eventually into their new environment, while still keeping in the back of their mind a future return. The exile lasted a total of thirteen years. In 1957, under Nikita Khrushchev rule, the government finally rehabilitated Chechens and authorized their return to Chechnya. Though «rehabilitated» in 1956 and allowed to return in 1957, they lost land, economic resources, and civil rights. Since then, under both Soviet and post-Soviet governments, they have been the objects of (official and unofficial) discrimination and discriminatory public discourse. The Prigorodnyj district around Vladikavkaz was given to North Ossetia in 1944, and Ingush homes and lands were given to

Ossetians. When the Ingush came back their property was not returned; they were forced to buy their houses and land back from the Ossetians, and the North Ossetian authorities prevented registration and employment of Ingush in the district. (There was an Ingush uprising in 1973 over this issue.)[88]

In late 1944, Stalin's right-hand man, Lavrenti Beria, passed an executive resolution declaring the Meskhetian Turks[89] and other smaller groups in the area «untrustworthy populations» that should be immediately deported from the Georgian Soviet republic to Central Asia. Between November 15 and 17, 1944, Soviet troops forcibly removed approximately 100,000 Muslims from the Meskhetian region, confiscating their belongings and placing them in cattle cars destined for the Soviet republics of Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, and Uzbekistan. The deportees who survived were sent to 18 districts all over Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, and Uzbekistan, where they were forced to live under «special settlement regimes» until 1956. Deprived of nearly all civic and political rights, most Meskhetian Turks worked as agricultural laborers. They had to register several times a month with the state police and were not entitled to travel anywhere outside of their settlement without the permission of the local commandant. Some of the local population were hostile to the newcomers, whom the NKVD (the forerunner of the KGB) had labeled «enemies of the people». For the first 12 years of their exile, Meskhetian Turk settlers suffered lives of extreme deprivation, discrimination, and constant supervision[90].

In 1949 about 37,000 Greeks living in Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan and the Krasnodar Region were deported to Kazakhstan.

---

[88] Aurélie Campana, The Massive Deportation of the Chechen People: How and why Chechens were Deported, Online Encyclopedia of Mass Violence, [online], published on 5 November 2007, accessed 6 May 2016, URL : http://www.massviolence.org/The-Massive-Deportation-of-the-Chechen-People-How-and-why, ISSN 1961-9898.

[89] Steve Swerdlow, Understanding Post-Soviet Ethnic Discrimination and the Effective Use of U.S. Refugee Resettlement: The Case of the Meskhetian Turks of Krasnodar Krai, 94 Cal. L. Rev. 1827 (2006). Available at: http://scholarship.law.berkeley.edu/californialawreview/vol94/iss6/5.

[90] Steve Swerdlow, Understanding Post-Soviet Ethnic Discrimination and the Effective Use of U.S. Refugee Resettlement: The Case of the Meskhetian Turks of Krasnodar Krai, 94 Cal. L. Rev. 1827 (2006). Available at: http://scholarship.law.berkeley.edu/californialawreview/vol94/iss6/5.

Like their fellow Greeks forcibly removed in 1944, they were accused of disloyalty and non-integration[91].

Thus as a consequences of the Stalin's time forced displacement of entire people Kazakhstan became Homeland for them.

Control questions:

1. Make a comparable analysis of historical memory on the Great Patriotic War, 1941-1945 in post-Soviet space.
2. Make a chtonological table of the deportation of peoples to Kazakhstan.
3. What were intentions of Soviet power during Stalin's time forced displacement of entire people?

6.2.3. Kazakhstan in the post-war period, 1946-1953

Today, assessing the results of the post-war reconstruction and economic development in the Soviet Union, it should be noted the paradoxical situation. On the one hand, the post-war five-year plan (1946-1950) gave a certain recovery effect and impetus to the further development of the economy. On the other hand, behind the prosperous post-war five-year rates there were hard labor of rural workers, poverty and starvation of the population, barbaric exploitation of child and female labour, low life expectancy, forced labor of millions of prisoners in the Gulag. Therefore, the national economy restoration was carried out thanks to the working enthusiasm of the people. Meanwhile, as the development of post-war Germany and Japan – countries that suffered a crushing defeat in the Second World War, the restoration of the destroyed economy was provided by the reforms of economic policies, by creating an economic motivation mechanism. Germany and Japan rose from the ashes of World War II to become global economic powerhouses in a few decades.

But how did they achieve this remarkable feat so quickly, and what is the legacy of these parallel economic «miracles» today? What was the state of both countries after WWII? Both nations lay in ruins. A significant proportion of the Japanese population was wiped

[91] Aurélie Campana, The Soviet Massive Deportations – A Chronology, Online Encyclopedia of Mass Violence, [online], published on 5 November 2007, accessed 6 May 2016, URL: http://www.massviolence.org/The-Soviet-massive-deportations-A-chronology, ISSN 1961-9898.

out during World War II, including an estimated 210,000 people in the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki alone. Germany had also lost millions of soldiers and civilians, with hundreds of thousands more killed in occupied eastern Europe. British and U.S. bombardments of German cities such as Dresden, conducted with conventional and incendiary explosives, caused a firestorm that killed up to 25,000 people and wiped out the historic city center. A quarter of Japan's national wealth evaporated during the war. By 1945, Germany was under the control of the Allied Powers in Europe: the United States, the USSR, Britain and France. Japan was occupied by the United States after its formal surrender. How fast did they recover? Japan became the second largest economy in the world after the United States in 1968, experiencing average growth of up to 9 percent per year between 1955 and 1973. The German «Wirtschaftswunder» economic miracle accelerated even faster, transforming West Germany into the world's second largest economic powerhouse by the 1950s. What effect did the Cold War have on economic policy? Beyond government policy, what drove growth? In Japan and Germany, economic turnaround was driven by firms with strong employee loyalty gained by the promise of rising wages and jobs for life, as well as innovative products that were exported worldwide. Whether they were prewar conglomerates such as Mitsubishi or Sumitomo, smaller prewar companies like automaker Toyota or new firms representing now-familiar brands – such as consumer electronics giant Sony and car manufacturer Honda – Japanese firms were rigidly hierarchical institutions that closely resembled a family or religious institution, according to experts. Tight coordination by the powerful industry ministry helped drive economic growth. In Germany, companies including Volkswagen, Siemens and Thyssen, operating in the automotive, electronics and engineering sectors, were all seen as pillars of post-war growth[92].

In the post-war period, the country's leaders hold the same industrial development strategy: emphasis was placed on the maximal development of the defense complex and heavy industry,

[92] How did Japan and Germany become global powerhouses after WWII? Электронный ресурс. Режим доступа: http://www.japantimes.co.jp/news/2015/08/13/national/history/japan-germany-become-global-powerhouses-wwii/#.Vv4IDeKLRD8.

with complete ignoring producing consumer goods. Thus, instead of industrial restructuring to meet the needs of a specific person, the country was increasing production of steel, iron, lead, and coal. The Kazakhstan industry was a vivid illustration of this policy[93].

During this period began building the Karaganda Metallurgical Plant, in Dzhezkazgan – the largest copper smelting plant in Ust-Kamenogorsk began operating the lead-zinc plant, increased the production capacity of the Balkhash smelter, increased coal producing in the Karaganda and Ekibastuz coal fields. In addition, in the period under review Kazakhstan was becoming an important link in the military-industrial complex of the USSR.

So, The Semipalatinsk Nuclear Test Site («The Polygon») was the primary nuclear testing site for the Soviet Union. It's about 150 kilometres west of the town Semey (named Semipalatinsk until 2007). The place was selected in 1947 by Lavrentiy Beria, head of the Soviet atomic bomb project, who claimed the huge steppe region was totally uninhabited. It wasn't, but nobody cared. Workers from Gulag camps were brought in to build a big complex of buildings and laboratories. Between 1949 and 1989 this place saw 456 nuclear tests, including 340 underground and 116 atmospheric explosions with mushroom clouds. These were roughly the equivalent of 2500 Hiroshima atomic bombs. The Soviets conducted these tests without any regard for the effects on the local environment or the almost quarter-million inhabitants of the area. With regard to the development of agriculture, it should be noted that after the war, a terrible drought in 1946 covered a vast territory of Moldova, the Ukraine, the Central Chernozemie, the Lower Volga region, the Primorsky Krai. Moldova and the Ukraine suffered from famine. Losses in the regions of bad harvest were compensated by increasing in the volume of grain procurement in other regions. In Kazakhstan, where the harvest was too far from to be rich, the state withdrew about 56% of the gross grain harvest. Livestock-raising of the Republic also remained in the hardest conditions. Complete ignoring the needs of the population, moreover, strengthening administrative

[93] Istoriya Kazahstana s drevnejshih vremen do nashih dnej v pyati tomah. T. 4. – Almaty: Atamura, 2010. – C. 539-546.

pressure led to the fact that the standard of living of people in the Soviet Union continued declining in comparison with the pre-war period. For urban residents were characteristic low purchasing power, withdrawal of money resources in the form of state loans, low wages and the high level of retail prices. Collective farmers' situation was especially difficult. Dimensions of wages were determined by the level of the collective farm income, which had been deliberately understated due to low purchasing prices for agricultural products. For example, in the grain production purchasing prices refunded only one-eighth of the cost, and in the livestock – even less. The main source of livelihood for the collective farmers remained personal plot housekeeping. Just at the expense of it collective farmers satisfied their requirements, but also had to one-third of the total money income. Taking it into account, the government introduced a tax on each homestead, which had a personal plot. Consequently, direct and indirect withdrawals remained a peasant family consumption only at a biologically acceptable minimum. With regard to the socio-political situation, it was marked by the «Cold War» – a long confrontation between the USSR and the Western powers, because of which the Soviet Union was drawn into an arms race, and was deprived of Western loans. During this period in domestic politics the Stalinist leadership strengthened control over the spiritual life of the people.

In Stalin's speech on the Victory Day, May 24, 1945 was clearly announced a policy of repressions against the peoples of the USSR. By proposing his toast not for the Soviet but for the Russian people, Stalin explained that the Russian people, was the guiding force of the Soviet Union that had played a decisive role in the war and was a recognized leader and the most outstanding nation of all nations that entered the Soviet Union. The post-war Soviet society development plans became a part of Stalin's totalitarian model of socialism. During this period the model of socialism ideology reached its peak (1940-1950). The Communist Party became the leading strength of the political system. Under the control of the party functioned all other parts of the system – public institutions, trade unions and other social organizations.

The leading role of the Communist Party meant the administrative-command party organs interference in different spheres of society. As propaganda invention of the Stalin era on the eve of its decline became a patriotism doctrine. Landmarks of the protective patriotism especially noticeably were shown in the humanities, namely: history, language, literature, and arts. In particular introducing the Soviet patriotism concept in literature went through the special position of Russian national literature, which was defined as dominant among literatures of all peoples of the USSR. During this period was forbidden to talk about the independent development of national self beyond the Russian influence.

The same situation was also characteristic for the humanities. So, in Kazakhstan Alkei Margulan's views were declared as pseudo-scientific. In 1952, from libraries were confiscated a number of books – «Batyrlarzhyry 1940», «Aitys», «Confessions of life» by K. Amanzholov, a collection of poems and essays about Malik Gabdullin – Hero of the Soviet Union. This period was characterized by the systematic and purpose-full campaigns against the spiritual heritage of the peoples of the USSR. In Kazakhstan, it led to serious consequences. Among the Kazakh youth started forming a stable inferiority complex of their culture and language. A distinctive feature of the post-war situation became personified repressions of the intellectuals. The Great Kazakh writer M. Auezov, prominent figures of literature and historical science P. Galuzo, E. Ismailov, H. Djumaliev, A. Konyratbaev, B. Kenzhebaev, A. Mametova and others were accused of obscuring the class struggle in the Kazakh aul, idealization of the feudal-clan system and were subjected to various kinds of repressions: from the expulsion from their places of work to arrests and judicial prosecution. At the same time there was an ideological revision of the concepts of linguistics and literary studies. In particular, it was argued that the literary Kazakh language originated after the Great October Revolution. As a guide of the Soviet patriotism ideology in historical science of Kazakhstan became a debate on the accession of Kazakhstan to Russia, which was considered in three dimensions – the «absolute evil», «the least evil», «a progressive phenomenon». «Bekmakhanov's case» should be considered the given context. In that period, was also convicted

the historian Bekzhan Suleimenov and many social scientists. This period is also characterized by increasing political censorship in art. The Soviet regime imposed to all the nations and cultures a single sample and standard of existence. Unification had gone so far that some people completely lost their ethnic and cultural identity. The state supported only the decorative side of the national specifics – national clothes, arts- songs and dances. In 1946, took place opening of the First Scientific Session of the Academy of Science of the Kazakh SSR. The first President was elected K. Satpayev. Under the Academy of Science of the Kazakh SSR were formed departments: geological and geographical sciences, engineering, chemical technology, physical and mathematical, biological and medical sciences. Within the departments worked 16 research institutes, 9 sectors, astronomical observatory, botanical garden. In general, despite the ideological dictates and significant shortcomings in the planning of scientific personnel, when it was not always taken into account the urgent tasks of economic development, the Kazakhstan science gained an incentive for the further development.

Control questions:

1. In the post-war period it was forbidden to speak about independent development of the national self beyond the connection with the Russian influence. Give examples from history of the Kazakh culture.
2. What was the main difference of the post-war restoration of economy in the USSR, Japan and Germany?
3. What new ideological campaigns of the post-war period influenced on the development of the post-war period culture?

6.3. Kazakhstan in the period of Khrushchev's reforms, 1953-1964

Assessing today Khrushchev era for the fate of the country as a whole and for Kazakhstan, it should be noted, ambiguity and the half-way undertaken reforms. On the one hand, during Khrushchev's era differed politically brightly pronounced reformist orientation. Just during this period was revised the traditional policy with regard to the village. In March 1953 was begun working out a new concept

of development. It was based on a decision of a sharp increase of investments in agriculture. Alongside with the growth of capital investment were raised purchasing prices for some agricultural products, softened the tax policy, and corrected rates of labour remuneration. Changes in the agricultural policy also got its implementation in Kazakhstan. At the first stage reforms yielded tangible results, but after 1957 their effectiveness fell and began recession. The reason was the methodology of extensiveness, which meant that progress in the agricultural sector went on not at the expense of the qualitative but quantitative aspects. The same direction was in the basis of industrial development. The only difference was that from the labor-intensive sectors the Soviet economy passed to the raw material intensive, energy-intensive and capital-intensive industries. Only in Kazakhstan by 1960 had been built and put into operation 83 large industrial enterprises. During this period the volume of industrial production in Kazakhstan amounted to 732% in relation to the 1940. The contradictory and half-way domestic policy were also characteristic for social and political life. So, in this period there was renunciation of Stalinism, at the same time, the System remained totalitarian and anti-legal, capable of solving any conflict exclusively with repressive measures. We can not help saying that in the Khrushchev era began a massive housing construction. Although large-scale construction was carried out at a relatively cheap standart projects, nevertheless people had the privilege to live in separate flats, they found fortune to have their own flat. In addition, researchers have noted that just during this period the well-being and standard of living had found tendency to the grown. As William Taubman, the author of the chapter on Khrushchev period in The Cambridge history of Russia, mentioned while the economy did not grow fast enough to satisfy Soviet leaders, the lives of ordinary citizens improved. Wages rose, meat consumption increased, consumer goods like televisions, refrigerators and washing machines became widely available. Stalin's legacy included a dreadful housing crisis: massive overcrowding, armies of young workers living in dormitories, multiple families crowded into communal apartments, with each family occupying one room and all sharing a single kitchen and

bathroom. In the Khrushchev period, the annual rate of housing construction nearly doubled. Between 1956 and 1965, about 108 million people moved into new apartments, many of them instandardised five-storey apartment houses built out of prefabricated materials in rapid, assembly-line fashion. Millions were grateful, but Khrushchev encouraged ever higher expectations, particularly by promising, in a speech presenting a new party programme to the Central Committee in June 1961, that the communist utopia itself would be 'just about built' by 1980[94]. In general, the internal policy of the Soviet state was carried out still in the framework of the administrative-command system, which functioned on the basis of the directive and planning principle[95]. The most striking evidence of inconsistency and ambiguity of the results was the implementation of a major project on developing virgin and fallow lands in Kazakhstan.

6.3.1. The development of virgin and fallow lands in Kazakhstan: Achievements and Challenges

At the beginning of the 1950s the Soviet state experienced quite an acute food crisis. Solving the food crisis was expected at the expense of sharp increasing areas under crops in the East of the country, as according to scientists of that time the increase in grain production in the traditionally existing agricultural areas – in the Ukraine and southern Russia was impossible because of insufficient development of the chemical industry. Meanwhile, as the world experience showed to solve the problem of grain shortage in the country they could at the expense of increasing productivity in grain sowing areas of the USSR by enhancing the technological discipline, for example snow retention in the fields. But the country's leadership chose the extensive model. The most massive ploughing was intended to implement in northern Kazakhstan. At the end of 1953 it

[94] William Taubman The Khrushchev period, 1953-1964 see in The Cambridge history of Russia. Vol.III. The Twentieth Century / Ed. By Ronald Grigor Suny. Cambridge University press. 2006. – P. 280.

[95] Masanov N.EH., Abylhozhin ZH.B., Erofeeva I.V. i dr. Istoriya Kazahstana: narody i kul'tury: Ucheb. posobie. – Almaty: Dajk-Press, 2001. – P. 331-334.

was accepted the plan on which during 1954-1957 areas under crops in Kazakhstan should be increased by 2.5 million ha[96].

If we consider the virgin lands in the realities of our days, its role for the country is unquestionable. Largely thanks to it Kazakhstan began entering into the grain belt of the Earth – quite a narrow strip of the globe, which includes the North of United States, Canada, France, the Ukraine, southern Russia and Argentina and Australia. Today, just these countries control the global situation on grain prices. Due to the ploughing of virgin lands in Kazakhstan are cultivated about 1,5 hectares per capita. Besides, today in Kazakhstan there is one of the world's largest centers of durum wheat production, which has high protein content. For comparison of hundreds of kilograms of soft wheat flour baked 91 kg of bread and durum wheat flour – 115 kg. 20-30% of strong wheat added to weak grain, provides high-quality bread (Strong and Weak/Soft wheat determined by quality and quantity of protein). The development of virgin lands in Kazakhstan played a major role in creating in the region a vast social and productive infrastructure, emerging of new and developing old towns. From 1954 to 1975, the length of paved roads increased by 14 times, and railway infrastructure increased by two and a half thousand kilometers. Only in rural areas were stretched 85 thousand km of electric power lines. For providing the virgin region with water were put to operation, such main water-supply communications (as the Bulaevsk water-pipe (1,400 km), Ishim (110 km), Pavlodar and Tselinograd (total about 670 km long). In rural areas were built hundreds of hospitals, clinics, schools and other objects of social and cultural purposes[97].

Consequently, as a result of virgin lands development the Republic has an opportunity not only to satisfy completely its own needs for grain, but also to enter the world market as a country – exporter of high-tech grain. Today Kazakhstan delivers high-quality grain in almost forty countries. However, for the characteristics of such a large-scale socio-economic action and it is important to

[96] Istoriya Kazahstana s drevnejshih vremen do nashih dnej v pyati tomah. T. 4. – Almaty: Atamura, 2010. – C. 588.

[97] Istoriya Kazahstana s drevnejshih vremen do nashih dnej v pyati tomah. T. 4. – Almaty: Atamura, 2010. – P. 593.

consider such aspects as environmental rationality, economic expediency and social efficiency. Already in the first years of 1957-1958 as a result of unprecedented ploughing began dust storms on light soils in the Pavlodar region, and in the early 1960 s soil blowing out processes covered all the land of the virgin region.

By 1960 in northern Kazakhstan, more than 9 million hectares of soil were exposed to wind erosion. However, later there were worked out soil-protective systems of farming, for example, moldboardless soil working. But these systems only mitigated the negative effects, but did not provide necessary protection of the environment. The Soviet Union lost a large amount of the top layer of soil, than any other country. Such information on the extent of the erosion was absent in the country, however according to the most prudent estimates of the Lester Brown World Observation Institute (USA), the top layer losses on arable lands of the former Soviet Union accounted for nearly 2.2 billion a year, in addition much of them falls on the virgin lands of Kazakhstan.

During the period of virgin lands development humus losses exceeded 1/3 of the original reserves in the chernozems and chestnut soils. The humus layer destroyed, and together with it losses of each millimeter layer on one hectare lost 76 kg of nitrogen, 240 kg phosphorus, 800 kg of potassium and no chemistry was able to compensate for these losses. Giant ploughing resulted in the growth of regional aridity. So, of 25 years (1960-1985) 23 years in the virgin areas of Kazakhstan, the Lower Volga turned out to be arid.

Thus, according to Zh. Abylhozhin, virgin lands ploughing in Kazakhstan could not help having scale negative projections for the Earth's ecology. With regard to economic expediency, today there are no statistics of economic costs. And they are very scale[98].

The extent involvement of the labor resources influenced on the magnitude of production costs (sometimes the numbers of employed in the grain fields reached more than 1 million people). Energy costs were also enormous and, were enormous because of the large territorial extension of virgin villages. With regard to the social

[98] See: Istoriya Kazahstana s drevnejshih vremen do nashih dnej v pyati tomah. T. 4. – Almaty: Atamura, 2010. – C. 590.

consequences of the virgin lands development, it is necessary to take into account the vast migration flow due to attracting labor resources from other republics. The extent of the labour resources involvement influenced on the magnitude of production costs (sometimes the numbers of employed in the grain fields reached more than 1 million people). Energy costs were also enormous and, were enormous because of the large territorial extension of virgin villages. With regard to the social consequences of the virgin lands development, it is necessary to take into account the vast migration flow due to attracting labor resources from other republics. For example, in the 1960-1965's. growth of the population of Northern Kazakhstan by 61% was provided by people from the RSFSR, the Ukraine, Moldova, Belarus. As a result, we observe, on the one hand, the formation here a wider contact zone. On the other hand, the vastness and uncontrolled migration flows had negative consequences. Regions - donors turned from labor surplus into regions with labor shortages (Nechernozemie). At the same time, the uncontrolled migration led to the fact that the share of the title population in Kazakhstan fell to 30%. It led to the narrowing of the range the Kazakh language functioning, as well as all the institutions of the Kazakh ethnos life – support. The negative consequences of the virgin lands include the aggravation of regional contradictions in developing productive forces of Kazakhstan. During this period, just the virgin became the center of attracting public investments to the detriment of other regions of the Republic [99].

In general, as the well-known Kazakhstan historian Zh. Abylhozhin notes: «There were not and there can not be any doubts that history of the virgin lands will remain forever inscribed in the glorious annals of the labor association of the Soviet people and the people of Kazakhstan. However, it should be recognized that in a deeply irrational Soviet model of economic development the virgin land could not to the end reveal its huge potential. Today, it makes the market ... Already now intensification of grain production, increasingly displacing the Soviet ideology of the endlessly expanding nature use, gives such the results, which makes us believe

[99] See: Istoriya Kazahstana s drevnejshih vremen do nashih dnej v pyati tomah. T. 4. – Almaty: Atamura, 2010. – C. 593.

in the positive future of the Kazakhstan virgin lands. And this is the best memory obelisk of all those who did its heroic page of our history»[100].

6.3.2. The public life in Kazakhstan during Khrushchev's reforms

First of all, it should be noted that the socio-political life in Kazakhstan and also all over the Soviet state was marked by the Khrushchev thaw. As is known, in 1956, took place the XX Congress of the CPSU, where the key issue was to overcome the consequences of the Stalin personality cult.

Undoubtedly the XX Congress of the CPSU was of great historical significance. N.S. Khrushchev and his associates have found the strength to admit Stalin's cult of personality, the unlimited power of the persons close to him. Of course, the report did not raise the question on the existence of the USSR totalitarian system, Stalinism lawlessness was connected basically only with the activities of certain concrete persons. However, the XX Congress of the CPSU and Khrushchev's secret speech was the beginning of the partial de-Stalinization and the democratization of the country life. Political reforms had a half-way charater. On the one hand, thousands of innocent prisoners were released from the camps. Many prominent party figures were rehabilitated. But, on the other hand, not all were released from prisons, not all were rehabilitated, for example, participants non-Bolshevik organizations, opposition of 1930-1940 s. Or, for example, were allowed to return to their historical homeland the deported Chechens, the Ingush, the Kalmyks, the Balkars, at the same time were not restored in rights the Koreans, the Germans, the Crimean Tatars and the Meskhetian Turks.

In 1954-1956 the Soviet government held a series of activities on elimination of excessive centralization and broadening the Union republics rights, at the same time with a number of adopted acts it nullified the proclaimed sovereignty. Only a small circle of Kremlin leaders decided issues relating to the economy, human resources

[100] See.: Istoriya Kazahstana s drevnejshih vremen do nashih dnej v pyati tomah. T. 4. – Almaty: Atamura, 2010. – P. 594.

policy. For example, in the case of any independence or unwillingness to follow the Moscow instructions the most energetic and promising cadres were transferred to another job or were removed from their jobs. In January 1961, was dismissed the excellent organizer, Chairman of the Council of Ministers Zhumabek Taschenev. In order were heard wording standard phrases. But the true underlying reason was Jumabek Tashenev's firm position, who defended the interests of the Republic. So, it is known his counteraction to the idea of the First secretary of the Regional Committee of Tselinna Kraikom Sokolov, who initiated the establishment of the sixteenth Tselinna Union republic with its Central Committee and the Council of Ministers on the basis of the five northern regions of Kazakhstan: Kokchetav, Kustanai, Pavlodar, North Kazakhstan and Tselinograd. The total area of the territory, which was defended by Zh. Taschenev was about 565.4 thousand sq. km, or one-fifth of present-day Kazakhstan[101].

It should be emphasized that the rights were extremely limited not only in Kazakhstan, but also of all the Republics. It was illustrated on the example of redrawing boundaries of the Republics by N. Khrushchev. So for example, in 1954 Soviets transferred Crimea from the Russian Soviet Republic to the Ukrainian Soviet Republic. In Kazakhstan, under Khrushchev, there was changing of borders with Uzbekistan in connection with of Khrushchev's the idea on concentration of the cotton production in the Central Asian republics with the dominant role of the Uzbek SSR. From of the Decree of Bureau of the Communist Party of Kazakhstan of 21.12.1962.: «To adopt the proposal of the South Kazakhstan Regional Committee of Communist Party of Kazakhstan on transferring cotton-growing collective and State farms, and developed lands of the Pahta-Aral, Ilichevsk and Kirov districts of the Chimkent of the Kazakh SSR to the Uzbek SSR»[102].

[101] Ismail Yusupov: Moya sovest' pered narodom Kazahstana chista. Avaiable at: http://www.nomad.su/?a=15-200404220016.

[102] Saktaganova Z.G. D. Kunaev i problemy izmeneniya granic Kazahstana. Avaiable at: rticlekz.com/article/5951.

Despite the renunciation of Stalinism, as it was noted above for the Khrushchev era were also characteristic by the repressive methods of struggle with disagreement on the general line of the Party. So, in the country in that period was also suppressed political dissent. The People, openly pointing to the vices of society began severely punished. In Kazakhstan, evidence of it was the Resolution of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Kazakhstan «On Errors of the Kazak Adebiety newspaper in covering some of the issues of cultural development in the country».

This resolution was a reflection of the party leadership dissatisfaction with publishing in the newspaper in 1956 a series of articles: «The greatest wealth of culture», «Respect the native language», «The question that needs revision», «Language culture». The Resolution stated that «the editorial staff of the newspaper was must strictly scientifically, with Marxist-Leninist positions show readers how thanks to the wise national policy of the Communist Party ... the Kazakh people during the years of the Soviet power had achieved unprecedented success in the development of its economy, science, literature, arts and people education. However, instead of a concrete, comprehensive and objective criticism of certain existing shortcomings and mistakes in the development of some aspects of the Kazakh people's culture, the newspaper in their elucidation assumed tendentiousness, one-sidedness, loudness and clamor».

From the text of the Resolution can be seen that the «clamor» was anxiety of the intelligentsia for the fate of the Kazakh language and one-sidedness and tendentiousness were considered to be attempts to return to the Kazakh people their cultural roots. In 1957, the attention of the head of the Republic was attracted by Rahmankul Berdybaev's article «Some problems of Kazakh literature». R. Berdybai article opposes ndiscriminate nihilistic approach to the most valuable layers of Kazakh literary heritage. He made bold to say that in the official literary criticism it was accepted to declare any work as anti-people, if there was «a single word against the Russian colonizers»[103].

[103] See.: Istoriya Kazahstana s drevnejshih vremen do nashih dnej v pyati tomah. T. 4. – Almaty: Atamura, 2010. – C. 598.

Of course, the talented scientist punished. Thus, the Soviet political system by taking the number of attempts of renovating nevertheless returned to its roots. Soon censorship was strengthened, began attacks on intellectuals, and in March 1963, Khrushchev called the intellectuals to follow the Party spirit principle. This call s in fact meant the end of the Khrushchev thaw.

In general, the Republic government failed to resist the extensive, costly nature of the economy, transforming Kazakhstan into a raw materials appendage of more economically developed regions. Central departments, Union ministries, while building new industrial giants on the territory of the Republic, did not take care of developing the social base, careful preservation of the ecological balance. Such neglect of social problems could not pass without leaving a trace. It often caused unrest and uprisings. So, in May and June 1954 there was a revolt of political prisoners in Kengir (Zhezkazgan), suppressed with tanks. The next major explosion of social unrest occurred in the summer of 1958 in Central Kazakhstan. In Temirtau Metallurgical Plant was declared Komsomol urgent construction and until the end of 1958, here arrived more than 200 thousand people. Many workers were placed in tents, because they did not have time to build houses. Difficult climate, shortage of drinking water, poor nutrition caused legitimate discontent. The riots began in August 1 and lasted three days. To stop them called forces, applied weapon. Mass riots occurred periodically in the Baltic States, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Chechnya-Ingushetia. Especially large were unrest in 1962 in Novocherkassk the Rostov region of the Russian Federation.

Control questions:

1. Show at the concrete examples, that renunciation of Stalinism on the Khrushchev period was half and half.
2. Prove that in the Khrushchev period practically all the Union Republics were limited in their rights.
3. Give pros and cons of developing virgin and fallow land in Kazakhstan.

6.4. Kazakhstan in the Brezhnev era, 1964-1982

In 1964, in the Soviet Union came to the power a new party-state group led by L.I. Brezhnev. The object of attention of the new government was the economy. In March and September, 1965 at the Plenums of the Central Committee CPSU were considered new ways of economic development, worked out measures to take the country out of crisis. But the reforms were initially doomed to failure because they did not affect property relations.

For example, the September Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee took a decision on extending rights and autonomy of enterprises. At the same time this decision was brought to nothing by the re-establishment of sectoral ministries. Then on the Ministries was put responsibility for distributing materials and equipment, leading industry branches' financing. Thus, the Ministries got super powers, transformed in time into industry branches supermonters, which got rights and autonomy of enterprises under. On 1 January 1966 in the USSR there were about 600 union and republican ministries. On the other hand, enterprises themselves also were not interested in independence. It was clear, because due to the lack of market mechanisms and a command system, it was convenient for enterprises managers to shift off responsibility for searching resources, realization of production, financing, etc.

Nevertheless, for some time reforms had caused a revival of the economy. During the Eighth Five-Year Plan (1966-1970) the economy has reached its highest levels for all the time of the planned economy introduction. At that time Kazakhstan developed quite rapidly, especially industry. During that period, the republic turned into an industrialized republic and occupied the third place in the USSR in terms of gross domestic product. Kazakhstan was the main base of non-ferrous metallurgy, had developed a fuel and energy complex, well-developed chemical industry, coal-mining industry and had a great potential of oil production.

In addition, Kazakhstan was one of the most important parts of the military-industrial complex of the USSR. On the territory of the Republic there was a powerful nuclear research and production complex, which included all the cycles of creating nuclear weapons -

from uranium mining to testing military loads. Moreover in Kazakhstan there were about 50 defense value enterprises.

These plants produced about 18% of all infantry fighting machines, 11% artillery systems, small arms and equipment for the Navy, torpedoes and aviation-ship mines, launchers for SS-21 tactical missiles. Missile Systems of coastal defense, on-board equipment for cruise missiles, submarine control systems, chemical and biological weapons. Kazakhstan also had military bases and testing grounds of strategic importance. Giant object of military-industrial complex had become the cosmodrome «Baikonur». On the territory of Kazakhstan were located other polygons that had the extraterritorial status. They included the Semipalatinsk nuclear test site, the Kapustin Yar testing ground Sarashagan polygon.

According to the 1989 census, in Kazakhstan there were more than 30 cities with populations over 50 thousand people, 19 cities – more than 100 thousand, 5 cities with more than 300 thousand. The 197 year the proportion of urban and rural residents equalized, but from 1980 citizens became predominant in the structure of the population.

In the structural context industry kept the raw materials orientation. Priority development got the fuel and energy complex, ferrous and non-ferrous metallurgy, chemical and petrochemical industry. As a result, there was a relative share of the extractive industry sector, while the share of machinery in total volume of industrial production was only 7% (27.4% for the USSR).

In the Republic there were almost no companies producing high-tech products. As well as all over the country in the country almost no enterprises producing civilian products. Beyond Kazakhstan were exported cheap raw materials and arrived expensive ready products. The balance of export-import was following: Kazakhstan exported products to 8 billion rubles and imported to the 16 billion rubles.

In general, the Brezhnev era for the Soviet economy became the time when all the sides of the command administration got revealed. On the one hand, we observe all over the country rapid development of industrial infrastructure. Only in Kazakhstan in 1976-1980 the number of constructed and put into operation large industrial enterprises reached 117 units, and in 1981-1985 – 60. As a result of

the industrial boom in Kazakhstan was increasing in the share of industry in the gross production of to 50%. Plans for steel, oil and coal were over fulfilled by millions of tons. But at the same time in Brezhnev's era began such obvious phenomena as hypertrophic metal consumption of industry, extremely unproductive resource use. For example, only in Kazakhstan electricity per capita was produced as in highly developed countries.

But the indices of energy consumption and economic development were inadequate. The deplorable situation was, also in the agricultural sector. Despite the constant increasing investments in agriculture, a twofold growth its power capacity, the volume of gross output not only increased, but tended to be descending. In the 1981-1985, more than half of the state and collective farms were unprofitable. In general, agriculture in Kazakhstan as all over the country was extremely expensive – the price realization did not reimburse even the cost of production.

Reflecting the failure of the agricultural sector was its inconsistency in providing society with food, particularly meat and dairy products. For example, the average food caloric content of Americans and for the Soviet people was about the same, but the Soviet consumer 46% of the daily ration had potatoes and bread, but meat and fish – only 8%. A characteristic feature of the Soviet economy of that period was the high level of inflation.

The strongest imbalance of demand and supply was evident of it. Given that prices were low and stable, most of the products were not available. The acutest shortage of most consumer goods was the result of ignoring the group «B» enterprises[104].

Many contradictions also accumulated in public and political life of the country. In the 1970s in the Soviet Union the real levers of the power were concentrated in the framework of the party-state apparatus. Characteristic features of the political system of the Soviet society were: restriction of democracy, estrangement of people from property and power, suppression of the individual. For this period, setting the gap between words and deeds, decisions and their execution was characteristic. For example, the government officially

[104] Masanov N.EH., Abylhozhin ZH.B., Erofeeva I.V. i dr. Istoriya Kazahstana: narody i kul'tury: Ucheb. posobie. – Almaty: Dajk-Press, 2001. – P. 354.

proclaimed internationalism, in fact, any appearance of national dignity, interest in the historical past, the language of any ethnic group was considered as a manifestation of nationalism.

Or, for example, according to the Constitution, citizens of the USSR had the right to associate in public organizations, they were guaranteed freedoms: of speech, press, assemblies, meetings, street processions and demonstrations. But the existing monopoly of the leading and guiding role of the CPSU turned these rights into fiction. In general, this period was characterized by a policy of Russification and ideological unification. In Kazakhstan as a result of development of virgin and fallow lands was a notable preponderance of the Russian population in the proportion of the total population. In Kazakhstan, as well as all over the country there were so-called dissidents – bearer of alternative ideas for the development of society and the country. They were-Kazakh students studying in Moscow (M. Tatimov, Baimukhanov S., B. Tayzhanov).

They were the first to notice the lagging position of the Kazakh aul, hidden discrimination against the Kazakh language and culture. In 1962, students created an informal organization «Zhas Tulpar», which lasted until 1966. In contrast to the Russian dissidents, the main requirements of whom was liberalization of the regime, the participants of the «Zhas Tulpar» put forward the idea of expanding the limits of national autonomy, improving the Republics status. It should be emphasized that the informal group «Jas Tulpar» did not represent opposition to the authorities, as the members of the group, assuming freedom of thought, did not affect the foundations of the regime. In terms of warming political climate the members of the group were not subjected to repression, but the group was broken up.

But such informal groups continued to appear in different parts of Kazakhstan. For example, the illegal party «Esep» (Karaganda), in Pavlodar – the party «Zhas Ulan». The purpose of these numerous organizations was to protect the Kazakh culture and language, the requirement of territorial integrity. In addition, there were also Kazakh dissidents in Kazakhstan.

For example, a high school teacher, a philosopher M. Kulmagambetov, was arrested in 1962 and sentenced to 10 years. In his personal case was recorded that he had been

convicted of the fact that «in the place of his residence and work expressed anti-Soviet fabrications discrediting the existing social system in the Soviet state... slandered the Communist Party, that is, the leaders of the party and government actions and policies carried out in USSR. It was also noted that M. Kulmagambetov spread harmful nationalistic opinions, praising life in the bourgeois countries, their democracy, political system and also capitalist production and the US economy»[105]. Another dissident, who was publicly convicted for beliefs and attitudes was Hasen Kozhahmetov. In November 1977 he was sentenced to two years in prison for «dissemination of deliberately false fabrications discrediting the Soviet state and social system. For example, a high school teacher, a philosopher M. Kulmagambeto. For the second time Secondary Hasen Kozhahmetov was convicted in 1987 for participating in the events of December 1986. Opposition moods of the Kazakhstan population, the Kazakh population especially the most sharply manifested in 1979 in Tselinograd. At the base of the Tselinograd conflict lay the Resolution of the CPSU Central Committee «On the formation of the German autonomous region» in Kazakhstan. After appearance of the Central Committee resolution on May 31, 1979 Kazakhstan's leaders began its implementing, in particular, clarifying the boundaries of the new region, on the placement organizations questions. But these actions caused a strong protest of the local population. Talking about the protest movement and dissent in the Brezhnev era, it should be emphasized that it was inherent to all Soviet society, not only to Kazakhstan. Therefore, students are encouraged to read the book by V.A. Kozlov[106], which presents a complete picture of the social protest manifestations throughout the USSR in the period from 1953 to the beginning of the 1980 s.

Another major problem of society in the Brezhnev era was the aggravation of environmental problems[107].

---

[105] See.: Istoriya Kazahstana s drevnejshih vremen do nashih dnej v pyati tomah. T. 4. – Almaty: Atamura, 2010. – P. 617.

[106] Kozlov V.A. Massovye besporyadki v SSSR pri Hrushcheve i Brezhneve (1953-nachalo 1980-h gg.) / Izdanie tret'e, ispravlennoe i dopolnennoe. – M.: Rospehn, 2009. Avaiable at: http://eland.ru/dirty/kozlov_massovyie_besporiadki_2010.pdf.

[107] This chapter was written on the base of chapter «The worsening of environmental problems». See: Istoriya Kazahstana s drevnejshih vremen do nashih dnej v pyati tomah. T.4. – Almaty: Atamura, 2010. – P. 620-630.

It was some of the results of economic development in the previous period. Predatory attitude towards the environment, resource consumption, growing urbanization, negative effects of the industrialization were the results of extensive economic model, which assumed a purely consumerist attitude to the natural environment were a common scourge of the whole Soviet country. In Kazakhstan due to the above-mentioned reasons emerged a wide range of environmental problems. But the main source of environmental problems for Kazakhstan was radioactive emissions. The source of them was primarily a military-industrial and military complex. Of course, in this series the Semipalatinsk nuclear test site had a special place as in 1949-1963 there were produced 124 ground, and after 1963 – 354 underground explosions. A lot of problems for the environment created testings about 24 thousand guided missiles, and also 11 air nuclear explosions in the Kapustin Yar. From 1966 to 1979, 17 underground nuclear tests were carried out at the site Azgir on the rock salts tracts of the Caspian depression.

Six underground nuclear explosions were carried out from 1983 to 1984 on the «Lira» object (Karachaganak). The negative role also played space and missile design in the Kazakh ecology. The Baikonur Cosmodrome is gigantic in its scales. It is located on the territory which is equal to 12 cities such as Moscow. But technological impact of industries unrelated to the military-industrial complex on the environment no less significant. The result of economic activities became hundreds of infected and contaminated water resources, millions of hectares of destroyed land, thoughtless destruction of forests, pollution of the air basin.

Through direct fault of the Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources of the USSR the Aral Sea region became a dead zone. The level of the Aral Sea fell by 14 meters, the water area decreased by 40%, the amount of water by 65%. The Sea lost its fishing industry significance. The dried seabed became a giant focus of salt accumulation and the emergence of salt storms. From the surface of the salt marshes, which occupy large areas of the dried bottom of the Aral Sea, into the atmosphere rise more than 65 million tons of toxic fine dispersed salt. Spreading to the west the

salt forms dust clouds, and transferred in all directions. Enormous damage to the environment was caused with extensive agriculture, for example, a nomadic farming method.

At this way of agriculture the fields, lost their fertility were withdrawn from circulation, but instead were ploughed new lands. Or, in order to make up deficiency of pastures, were burned relict forests in the flood-lands of the Syrdalya, Zhanadarya, Kolgandarya and Kuvandarya rivers. As a result, were completely destroyed forests in the Aral Sea region. In these rivers delta also disappeared large areas of reed that was cut down to make paper. The Aral delta turned into swamps and takyrs. Harmful gaseous, liquid and solid wastes of industries negatively influenced on the environment. For the environment protection was used technically outdated palliative techniques: higher chimneys, creation of green sanitary zones. Of particular concern is air pollution. The sources of pollution became non-ferrous metallurgy enterprises in the of Balkhash, Shymkent, Leninogorsk cities. One of the disadvantaged regions was the East Kazakhstan region. Special measurements have revealed that more than 100 harmful chemicals contained in the air of the region cities. Of particular concern are the high concentration of heavy metals in the air. In terms of lead pollution Ust-Kamenogorsk occupied one of the first places in the list of the most polluted cities in the USSR. In the category of the most disadvantaged industrial centers by pollution was also included Leninogorsk.

Another consequence of neglecting environmental issues was the depletion of mineral resources that took place due to losses of minerals. According to preliminary data, in the process of production was lost about 50% of mineral resources. Moreover half of the losses were economically unjustified. One of the major global problems is the pollution of natural waters, the deterioration of the natural environment of their formation. Illustrative in this respect may be Kazakhstan, where an acute shortage of water resources and their pollution created a number of problems.

Up to the mid-1960s in the country was not conducted an active and systematic work on the protection and rational use of water resources. By 1966, only 66 enterprises had wastewater treatment plants. Only in basins of the rivers Irtysh, Ural, Tobol, Ishim,

Karatal, Badam annually were dumped over half a billion cubic meters of wastewater only 20% were subjected to pre-treatment. On the brink of extinction were set forests of the country. Irrational cutting down forests, neglecting with planting new trees led literally to the critical situation. The problem of nuclear waste became threatening. In Kazakhstan, were revealed about 100 places of their storage.

The area of radioactive contamination exceeded 35 sq. km. Large pockets of contamination were also enterprises involved to implement the nuclear program: the Tselinny and the Caspian mining and metallurgical complexes, the Mangyshlak power complex, the Ulba Metallurgical Plant in East Kazahstan were a monopolist in the production of fuel elements for nuclear reactors containing low-enriched uranium. Nuclear infrastructure led vast territories to radioactive contamination.

In the Republic was not solved the problem of burying used ionizing radiation sources and radioactive residues of industrial slag waste. We can not say that the Soviet government completely ignored environmental concerns. But the adopted resolutions and decrees were largely declarative in nature, besides they did not take into account local and regional specificities. A major role in attracting attention to environmental issues played the head of the Party organization of Kazakhstan D. Kunaev.

He wrote: «It is important to strengthen sharply the struggle against air pollution of industrial centers, including the capital of the Republic, to improve the protection of soils from different waste pollution, water and wind erosion, secondary salinization, to intensify the fight for the purity of rivers and other water reservoirs, to expand afforestation, to provide protection from mudflows and floods, to deliver a reliable barrier to poaching, to protect nature and its defenders against any encroachments»[108].

Since 1974 began being developed annual and long-term plans for the rational use of natural resources. The state finally began to invest in the construction of environmental protection facilities. During the period 1975-1980 for this purposes were spent about

[108] See.: Istoriya Kazahstana s drevnejshih vremen do nashih dnej v pyati tomah. T.4. – Almaty: Atamura, 2010. – P. 629.

700 million rubles. Thanks to these measures were introduced into operation to artificially-biological treatment plants in Ust-Kamenogorsk and Almaty, mechanical treatment facilities in Karaganda and a recycling plant in Almaty.

For the protection of air basin from harmful emissions at the industrial enterprises of the Republic were introduced plants for catching and decontaminating harmful substances and waste gases with a total capacity of 15 million 819 cubic meters per hour. It should be noted that numerous resolutions, decisions and decrees on the environment protection issues did not give the desired effect because the Soviet economy itself based on the extensive model was focused on an infinitely expanding nature use. Therefore, the principle of environmental sustainability simply did not meet the interests of the state. In addition, a non-market character of the Soviet economy doomed all its segments to the predatory and irrational use of natural resources, which were public property. In the West, such predatory use of natural resources was not possible in the conditions of the existence of private property, and fierce competition.

Thus, having considered various aspects of Soviet life in the Brezhnev era, we can conclude that by 1980 Soviet society was experiencing a condition which was characterized by the concept of crisis. The crisis was shown in all aspects of life – from economy to social and cultural spheres. The crisis was apparent because of the fact that whatever actions, absorbing human and material resources were taken to improve the condition, they do not produce results.

Control questions:

1. Prove that all economic reforms undertaken in Brezhnev era were doomed to failure.
2. Prove the thesis: Social and political situation in the country as a whole and in Kazakhstan in particular was characterized with a contradictory nature of development.
3. Prove that Kazakhstan's industry was raw material appendix of the Soviet economy.
4. Enumerate and give concrete examples of main sources of ecological problems in Kazakhstan.
5. What harm for the environment did such kind of agriculture activities as a nomad farming do?

6.5. Kazakhstan in the Gorbachev era, 1964-1982[109]

With the coming to power of MS Gorbachev in the Soviet Union began the systematic socio-economic and political actions aimed at reforming society. They entered the history of the country under the name of restructuring. In the development of this period marked out several stages. At the first stage the country's leadership the main task saw in measures for labour productivity growth and the acceleration of social development. Therefore, at this stage, the slogan was the word «acceleration».

The country's leadership believed that the impulse for acceleration can be the fight against hard drinking and the toughening discipline in the workplace. But the most important factor in accelerating was seen the idea of renovation of production facilities – machines, equipment, technologies. Restructuring architects believed that by reallocating foreign currency resources from the purchases of consumer goods for the purchase of the machine-building exports it would be possible by 1990 to bring the production machinery to the level of world standards.

In their view, the productive apparatus renovation should have led to a sharp increase in labor productivity. In the agricultural sector the opportunity to acceleration was seen in the implementation of scientific and technological revolution, new technologies and other factors of agricultural production intensification. But in the absence of market mechanisms and private ownership groundlessness of accelerating was apparent both in the industrial and in agricultural sectors. With regard to the toughening discipline in the workplaces, the measure contributed to a temporary increase in the efficiency of production (the first year of the restructuring). But the struggle with alcoholism led to an increase in the budget deficit, since one-third of the budget was formed at the expense of the sale of alcoholic beverages.

The second phase of the restructuring (summer 1987 – May 1989) was characterized by inconsistent attempts to combine the

[109] Masanov N.EH., Abylhozhin ZH.B., Erofeeva I.V. i dr. Istoriya Kazahstana: narody i kul'tury: Uchebnoe posobie. – Almaty: Dayk-Press, 2001. – S. 355-366; Archie Brown. The Gorbachev era // The Cambridge history of Russia. Vol.III: The Twentieth Century / Ed. By Ronald Grigor Suny. Cambridge University Press. 2006. P. 316-351.

planned economy and market forces, the establishment of a socialist market model. Private property was not yet a tangible presence in the lives of people, it was replaced by a far-fetched hybrids - lease, lease contract. Obvious examples of half-measures became laws on state enterprises and cooperatives.

The third phase of the restructuring (May 1989- August 1991) was characterized by the overcoming of bureaucratic nomenclature resistance and the creation of a new center of decision-making. A new body of pushing reform ideas became the People's Parliament formed after the elections in 1989 It was on the rostrum of the First Congress of People's Deputies (May 1989) by an active struggle for the transition to a market economy and private property as the most important condition for the creation on the ruins of the totalitarian empire a democratic society. At the very beginning of the restructuring was declared the official directions on the full democratization of all aspects of social life – policy of glasnost. From very early in the Gorbachev era one of the key concepts given emphasis was glasnost', meaning openness or transparency, although glasnost, like perestroika, was about to enter the English and other languages, such was the international impact of the changes in the Soviet Union. In each year that followed 1985 glasnost' became increasingly indistinguishable from freedom of speech. There were, nevertheless, occasions when glasnost' was conspicuous by its absence. The most notable was the disaster at the Chernobyl' nuclear power station in Ukraine on 26 April 1986. The news of what turned out to be the world'sworst nuclear accident thus far came to Soviet citizens from the West by foreign radio (in a reversion to what was common in the unreformed Soviet system). It was not until 28 April that the accident was noted by Soviet television and much later before any detailed account was provided. Those within the Soviet Union who wished change to progress faster used Chernobyl', however, as an illustration of what was wrong with the system – from shoddy work at the nuclear plant, to the local attempt to cover up the scale of the disaster, to the reluctance of the Soviet leadership and mass media to provide prompt and accurate information about the catastrophe. The more reform-oriented parts of the mass media were soon carrying articles very critical of the absence of glasnost' on this occasion, a

development that in itself would have been impossible prior to 1985 when even air crashes and some natural disasters in the Soviet Union went unreported in order to convey the impression that all was well on the home front. When, following Chernobyl', every catastrophe, whether natural (such as the Armenian earthquake in 1988) or man-made, was extensively reported and commented on, it appeared to some Soviet citizens that the incidence of misfortune had increased[110].

But soon the December events in Alma-Ata in 1986 found that the publicity cannot be fully implemented in the framework of the administrative-command system and the political monopoly of the CPSU. The reason for the December events was the displacement of D. Kunaev in December 16, 1986, who did a lot for the socio-economic and cultural development of Kazakhstan. D. Kunayev was a type of leader who possessed great erudition and culture. He was rather considerate towards the most striking representatives of science, literature and arts. The reason for the December events was the fact that the head of the Republic was put the man who was not even its native. Such slighting attitude of the leadership of the country violates the Kazakhs dignity, their self-consciousness, and caused resentment for the public demonstration of refusal in confidence to the people and its representatives.

But the reasons of deeper nature were such factors as failures in national and social policy, economy, marginalization of the population and students. The December riots in Alma-Ata were dispersed with the use of military force. Were used militia, army and fire brigades, were detained about 2,400 demonstrators, were injured 1722 men. In the course of subsequent persecutions 99 men were prosecuted, 309 students were expelled from universities.

It should be noted that the December events were only one of the links in the series of events. As series of flashpoints in particular republics exemplified and exacerbated nationality-related problems. The appointment of a Russian, Gennadii Kolbin, as first secretary of the CPSU in Kazakhstan (on the recommendation of the outgoing first secretary, Dinmukhamed Kunaev) in December 1986 provoked

[110] Archie Brown. The Gorbachev era // The Cambridge history of Russia. Vol.III: The Twentieth Century / Ed. By Ronald Grigor Suny. Cambridge University Press. 2006. – P. 323.

riots in Alma Ata (Almaty). In July 1987 Moscow's Red Square was the scene of a sit-down demonstration by Crimean Tatars demanding to be allowed to return to the homeland from which they had been exiled by Stalin. From February 1988 the temperature of the dispute between Armenia and Azerbaijan over the land of Nagorno-Karabakh was seldom below boiling point. The federal authorities found this an especially intractable problem, since both Armenians and Azeris were utterly convinced of their historic claim to the territory. The fact that this predominantly Armenian enclave was within the Soviet republic of Azerbaijan had long been a sore point for Armenians. It was – for Gorbachev and the federal authorities – just one of the unintended consequences of liberalisation that Armenians in their tens of thousands felt able to raise the issue sharply less than three years into perestroika. The dispute led to inter-ethnic violence in 1988 with at least thirty-two people, mainly Armenians, killed in the city of Sumgait in Azerbaijan where many more Armenian homes were wrecked. In turn there were fatal attacks on Azeris in Nagorno-Karabakh and in Armenia itself. A further escalation of violence occurred in 1990 when a pogrom of Armenians in Baku killed at least sixty people. This led Gorbachev's special envoy, Evgenii Primakov, to urge strong action against the Popular Front in Azerbaijan. The indiscriminate nature of the onslaught subsequently ordered by Soviet senior officers on the spot produced an official death toll of eighty-three, though according to Azeri nationalist sources several hundred people may have died. The cycle of violence merely further inflamed national passions and did nothing to resolve the problems. This was never more evident than in the case of the violent suppression of a peaceful demonstration by young people in Tbilisi in April 1989. Soviet troops, with the support of the first secretary of the CPSU in Georgia (and against the explicit wishes of Gorbachev who had asked Shevardnadze to fly to Georgia to negotiate a peaceful end to the stand-off), brutally attacked the protestors. Nineteen of the demonstrators (mainly young women) were killed and several hundred were injured. From that time on, Georgian nationalism was more than ever a force to be reckoned with. Similarly, violence against protesters in the Lithuanian capital, Vilnius, and the Latvian capital, Riga, in early 1991 merely added

fuel to the fires of national discontent. While the institutional changes were especially important in permitting national movements to gain a strong foothold within a system in flux, the withering away of Marxism-Leninism also played a part. Although many officials, not to speak of ordinary citizens, had paid only lip-service to the ideology, its thorough debunking by the end of the 1980s left space open for other ideologies, of which nationalism turned out to be especially important for the future (or, more precisely, non-future) of the Union[111].

Glasnost – the main slogan of this phase of the restructuring was admitted to the sphere of cultural and intellectual life, but there was a strict taboo in all that concerned the System as a whole. In addition, the scope of what was permitted in Kazakhstan was narrowed in connection with Kazakh nationalism fight. Thus, the unlawful theme in Kazakhstan was still activity of the national-liberal intelligentsia, repressed by Stalin's regime. In Kazakhstan, the whole publicity was turned into the criticism of corruption in the press, human and regional protectionism. Plenty of space in the press was given to the fight against privileges. A lot of empty words were spent on the fight against criminality, alcoholism, but the main thing was that the propaganda context was deployed in a way that caused not only inter-ethnic break-up, but the opposition of the north and south. Thus, in Kazakhstan publicity borders were significantly narrowed compared to the major cities Moscow and Leningrad.

However, changes in the socio-political life also were going here. Already in 1987, in Kazakhstan appeared the first informal associations. Start for the informal movement was put by environmental organizations. In 1987 was created the Public Committee the Aral Sea and Lake Balkhash problems, in many cities were set up environmental associations (Alma-Ata, Dzhambul, Taldy-Korgan, Ust-Kamenogorsk). In 1991 there was formed the organizing committee of the Tabigat Party of Justice and the ecological restoration of Kazakhstan headed by M. Yeleusizov.

The next stage in the development of informal organizations was the creation of national and cultural, historical and educational

[111] Archie Brown. The Gorbachev era // The Cambridge history of Russia. Vol.III: The Twentieth Century / Ed. By Ronald Grigor Suny. Cambridge University Press. 2006. – P. 345.

associations. Among them was particularly distinguished the Adilet society (revelations of the Stalinism crimes) and Kazak tili – the Society for promoting study and dissemination of the Kazakh language. In the further evolution of the informal movement were created nationalist-radical organizations with political orientation. For example, the Zheltoksan movement (summer 1989), which in May 1990 was in the party same of the name. The ultimate goal of the party became seceding from the Soviet Union and the creation of an independent state.

In the summer of 1990 was registered the Azat Civil Movement, which included a significant part of the national intelligentsia and the state apparatus employees. The Azat also declared its aim Kazakhstan's sovereignty, while offering a more flexible policy in the field of ethnic relations, advocating for inter-ethnic harmony and accounting multiethnic composition of the Republic's population. The most radical in terms of nationalistic orientation was the Alash National Freedom party. The main program highlight of the Alash was to achieve real independence of Kazakhstan, especially from Russia, the promotion of the Pan-Turkism ideas. In 1991, on the basis of the Slavic a national-cultural center was created the Lad movement.

During this period, there also appeared associations of the Cossacks. Although as their purpose they proclaimed the revival of cultural and ethnographic traditions, the most extremist leaders came forward with destructive demands. In the years under consideration it became apparent that the socio-political movements developed mainly on the basis of ethnic break-up. At the same time more and more significant role in the socio-political life of the country and played parties and movements declaring the idea of the nation as citizenship. Just on this consolidation of the society worked Nevada-Semipalatinsk the antinuclear movement, the People's Congress of Kazakhstan Party.

But in this period, the Communist Party continued to claim the role of leading and guiding force. But its authority began falling. Held in the middle of the 1988 the All-Union Conference of the CPSU, and then its Congress showed complete failure of the Party to reforming. Criticism and opposition on the part of the society took an irreversible character. The logical conclusion of it became August

events of 1991 (the Moscow putsch and its liquidation by B.Yeltsin). The putsch was, however, a mortal blow both for the Union and for the leadership of Gorbachev. In September 1991 there was dissolution of the Communist Party of Kazakhstan.

Events in the USSR developed dynamically. The crisis in the economy and erosion of the totalitarian foundations in the society and the state. The events in the Caucasus, Central Asia and the Baltic States. Distrust of the Republics to each other and to the Centre was growing. In 1990 there was introduced the post of President of the USSR, while retaining the post of Secretary General. After that, in all the Republics – were established the President posts. In April 24, 1990, the Supreme Council of the Republic established the post of the President of the Kazakh SSR. At the Session of the Parliament N. Nazarbayev was elected by secret ballot as President of the Kazakh SSR. In October 25, 1990 the Supreme Council of the Republic adopted the Declaration of the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic State Sovereignty.

During 1990-1991, when in the country was debated the future of the Soviet Union, Kazakhstan advocated the retaining of the Union on the principles of a renewed federation and sovereignty of the Republics. However, there prevailed the centrifugal tendencies that led to the downfall of the Soviet superpower.

Having seen how close they had been to being fully reincorporated in a Soviet state which would have been a throwback to the past, the Baltic States instantly declared their independence. This was recognized by the Soviet Union on 6 September. Four days later Armenia followed suit, while Georgia and Moldova already considered themselves to be independent. While Gorbachev had been isolated on the Crimean coast, Yeltsin had been the public face of resistance to the coup, and Gorbachev's position became weaker and Yeltsin's stronger in its aftermath. Taking full advantage of this further shift in the balance of power, Yeltsin was no longer content with the draft Union Treaty that was to have been signed in August. New negotiations saw further concessions from Gorbachev which would have moved what remained of a Union into something akin to a loose confederation. Ultimately, this did not satisfy the leaders of the three Slavic republics – Yeltsin, Leonid

Kravchuk of Ukraine, and Stanislav Shushkevich of Belarus. At a meeting on 8 December 1991 they announced that the Soviet Union was ceasing to exist and that they were going to create in its place a Common wealth of Independent States. 10 December 1991 the first President of Kazakhstan Nursultan Nazarbayev took the office. The Supreme Council of the Republic has decided to rename the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic to the Republic of Kazakhstan. The Supreme Council declared the law «On the State Independence of the Republic of Kazakhstan» in December 16, 1991.

With the signing of the Agreement on the Establishment of the Commonwealth of Independent States (8 December 1991) and the Protocol to the Agreement (Alma-Ata, December 21 1991), the Soviet Union as a state entity ceased to exist. Then began new stage of historical development of Kazakhstan as a sovereign state[112].

Control questions:

1. Prove the thesis that in Kazakhstan borders were significantly narrowed compared to the major cities Moscow and Leningrad.
2. Why did not economic reforms in the period of the restructuring have due effect?
3. One of the consequences of the reforming policy in the Soviet state in the perestroika period became a splash of the nationalism ideology. Show on the concrete examples that a splash of the nationalism ideology was characteristic not only to Kazakhstan.

Test questions:

1. What projects on industrialization of Kazakhstan were there in the middle of the 1920s of the XX c.?
2. Write an essay of 500 words on the topic: «What project industrialization of Kazakhstan did the Kazakh national intellectuals defend».
3. What was the essence of the transforming agriculture from predominantly individual farms into a system of large state collective farms? What were peculiarities of this process in Kazakhstan?
4. Read the following articles:
   a. Isabelle Ohayon, The Kazakh Famine: The Beginnings of Sedentarization, Online Encyclopedia of Mass Violence, [online], published on 28 September 2013, accessed 24 May 2016, URL: http://www.massviolence.org/The-Kazakh-Famine-The-Beginnings, ISSN 1961-9898.

[112] Archie Brown. The Gorbachev era // The Cambridge history of Russia. Vol.III: The Twentieth Century / Ed. By Ronald Grigor Suny. Cambridge University Press. 2006. – P. 347.

b. Cameron, S. (2016). THE HUNGRY STEPPE: FAMINE, MASS VIOLENCE AND THE MAKING OF SOVIET KAZAKHSTAN. [online] Available at: https://www.irex.org/sites/default/files/Sarah%20Cameron%20scholar%20research%20brief_0.pdf [Accessed 24 May 2016].
c. Niccolò Pianciola, « Famine in the steppe », Cahiers du monde russe [En ligne], 45/1-2 | 2004, mis en ligne le 19 janvier 2007, Consulté le 09 janvier 2014. URL : http://monderusse.revues.org/2623.

5. Write a paper in 5 pages (times new romans 12, 1,5 spacing) on the topic: A comparative analysis of the Modern Western scholars views on the famine in Kazakhstan causes.
6. Prove that the establishment of a new school education system was the main achievement of the Bolsheviks in the building new culture in Kazakhstan.
7. Prove that Soviet power conducted a tough policy concerning artistic culture (all over the country).
8. What two aims did the Bolsheviks pursue while conducting cultural modernization of the country? What were the peculiarities of implementing this policy in Kazakhstan?
9. Make a comparable analysis of historical memory on the Great Patriotic War, 1941-1945 in post-Soviet space.
10. In the post-war period it was forbidden to speak about independent development of the national self beyond the connection with the Russian influence. Give examples from history of the Kazakh culture.
11. Show at the concrete examples, that renunciation of Stalinism on the Khrushchev period was half and half.
12. Give pros and cons of developing virgin and fallow land in Kazakhstan.
13. Prove that all economic reforms undertaken in Brezhnev era were doomed to failure.
14. Why did not economic reforms in the period of the restructuring have due effect?
15. One of the consequences of the reforming policy in the Soviet state in the perestroika period became a splash of the nationalism ideology. Show on the concrete examples that a splash of the nationalism ideology was characteristic not only to Kazakhstan.
16. Prove that Kazakhstan's industry was raw material appendix of the Soviet economy.
17. What harm for the environment did such kind of agriculture activities as a nomad farming do?

Seminar tasks

1. Process of national and state building in Kazakhstan in pre-war period, 1917-1939?
2. Main methods of familiarizing of the Kazakhs with Soviet standards of culture?
3. Soviet project of modernization and its implementation in Kazakhstan.
4. Deportation of peoples to Kazakhstan, 1939-1945.
5. Main sources of ecological problems in Kazakhstan.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Jeremy Tredinnick. Pre-history: Human migrations and the the stone age // See: Tredinnick J. An illustrated History of Kazakhstan: Asia's Heartland in Context. Published by Odyssey Books & Maps. 2014. – P. 20.
2. History of Civilizations of Central Asia.Volume II: The Development of Sedentary and Nomadic Civilizations: 700 B.C. to A.D. 250 / Edited by Janos Harmatta, B.J. Puri, and G.F. Etemadi – Paris: UNESCO Publishing, 1999. – P. 23.
3. Tong-Yabghu-Kagan // See: http://www.statemaster.com/encyclopedia.
4. Battle of Talas in 751. See online encyclopedia Statemaster.com URL: http://www.statemaster.com/encyclopedia/Battle-of-Talas.
5. Agajanov S. G. The States of the Oghuz, the Kimek and the Kipchak. – P. 74-77. URL: http://ru.unesco.org/silkroad/sites/silkroad/files/knowledge-bank-article/vol_IVa%20silk%20road_the%20states%20of%20the%20oghuz,%20the%20kimek%20and%20the%20kipchak. pdf. Avaiable: 20 June. 2016.
6. Ancient Turkish Religious Beliefs (Pre-Islam). Posted: 17 June. 2005. URL: http://www.allempires.com/forum/forum_posts.asp?TID = 4017.
7. Kappeler A. Yuzhnyj i vostochnyj frontir Rossii v XVI-XVIII v. // Av Imperio. Rossijskaya imperiya: okrainy i granicy. – Kazan', 2003. – № 1. – S.61. Ibid. – P.49-50.
8. Mejer L. Kirgizskaya step' Orenburgskogo vedomstva // Materialy dlya geografii i statistiki Rossii Orenburgskogo vedomstva, sobrannye oficerami General'nogo shtaba. – T. 10: Kirgizskaya step' orenburgskogo vedomstva – Spb., 1865; Krasovskij N.I. Oblast' sibirskih kirgizov // Materialy dlya geografii i statistiki Rossii… – T.1: Oblast' sibirskih kirgizov. – Spb., 1868; Lobysevich F. Postupatel'noe dvizhenie Rossii v Srednyuyu Aziyu v torgovom i diplomaticheskom otnosheniyah. – SPb., 1900.
9. Levshin A.I. Opisanie kirgiz-kazach'ih, ili kirgiz-kajsackih, ord i stepej. – 2-e izd. – Almaty, 1996; Vel'yaminov-Zernov V.V. istoricheskie izvestiya i kirgiz-kajsakah i snosheniya Rossii so Srednej Azieyu so vremen konchiny Abulhair-hana (1748-1765). – T.1. – Ufa, 1853.
10. Lobysevich F. Postupatel'noe dvizhenie v Srednyuyu Aziyu v torgovom i diplomatichesko-voennom otnosheniyah. – SPb., 1900. – S. 38-39.
11. Maksheev A. Istoricheskij obzor Turkestana i nastupatel'noe dvizhenie na nego russkih. – Spb., 1890. – S. 103.

12. Rossiya i Kazahstan: problemy vzaimodejstviya (XVI – XX veka) // Rossiya, Zapad i musul'manskij Vostok v kolonial'nuyu ehpohu. – SPb., 1996. – S. 9.
13. Materialy dlya geografii i statistiki Rossii, sobrannye oficerami general'nogo shtaba. T. 10: Kirgizkaya step' Orenburgskogo vedomstva / Sostavil general'nogo shtaba podpolkovnik L. Mejer. – Spb.1865. – S. 2.
14. Brezhneva S. Prisoedinenie Turkestana k Rossii: diskussionnye problemy dorevolyucionnoj i sovetskoj istoriografii. – Tol'yatti, 2004. – S. 150-155.
15. Ryazanov A.F. 40 let bor'by za nacional'nuyu nezavisimost' kazahskogo naroda. – Ch.1: Vosstanie sultana Karataya Nuralieva (1797-1826). – Kyzyl-Orda, 1926; Bajmurzin A. Iz istorii zahvata carizmom Bol'shoj i Srednej Ord. – Alma-Ata, 1940.
16. Asfendiyarov S. Istoriya Kazahstana (s drevnejshih vremen). – Almaty, 1935. – T. 1. – S. 174-175.
17. Vyatkin M.P. Politicheskij krizis i hozyajstvennyj upadok v Maloj Orde v konce XVIII – nachale XIX vv. // Materialy po istorii Kazahskoj SSR. T. 4: (1785 – 1828 gg.) / Pod red. M. Vyatkina. – M., L., 1940. – S. 4-5.
18. Matvievskij P.E. Abulhair – pobornik edineniya kazahskogo naroda s russkim // Uchenye zapiski Chkalovskogo pedinstituta im. V.P. Chkalova: Seriya istorii i pedagogiki. – Vyp. 1. – Chkalov, 1949. – S. 66-111.
19. Bekmahanov E. Kazahstan v 20-40-e gody XIX veka. – Alma-Ata, 1948.
20. Apollova N.G. Prisoedinenie Kazahstana k Rossii v 30-h godah XVIII veka. – Alma-Ata, 1948.
21. Rozhkova M. K. EHkonomicheskaya politika carskogo pravitel'stva na Srednem Vostoke vo vtoroj chetverti XIX v. i russkaya burzhuaziya. – M., L., 1949.
22. Nechkina M.V. K voprosu o formule «naimen'shee zlo». Pis'mo v redakciyu // Voprosy istorii. – 1951. – № 4; Mustafaev M.O. O formule «naimen'shee zlo» // Voprosy istorii. – 1951. – № 9; Yakunin A.O. O primenenii ponyatiya «naimen'shee zlo» v ocenke prisoedineniya k Rossii nerusskih narodnostej // Voprosy istorii. – 1951. – № 6; – № 11.
23. Braginskij I. S., Radzhapov S., Romodin V. A. K voprosu o znachenii prisoedineniya Srednej Azii k Rossii // Voprosy istorii. – 1953. – № 8.
24. Бекмаханов Е. Присоединение Казахстана к России. – М., 1957.
25. Problema russko-kazahskih vzaimosvyazej v XVIII – nachale XIX vv. – Alma-Ata, 1980; Social'no-ehkonomicheskie i istoricheskie predposylki i progressivnoe znachenie prisoedineniya Kazahstana k Rossii: Mezhvuzovskij sbornik. – Alma-Ata, 1981; Sulejmenov B.S., Basin V. YA. Kazahstan v sostave Rossii v XVI – nachale XX vv. – Alma-Ata, 1981; Svetloj dorogoj druzhby i bratstva: Sbornik materialov o prazdnovanii 250-letiya dobrovol'nogo prisoedineniya Kazahstana k Rossii. – Alma-Ata, 1982; Naveki vmeste, k 250-letiyu dobrovol'nogo prisoedineniya Kazahstana k Rossii. Alma-Ata, 1982;SHoinbaev T. Zh. Dobrovol'noe vhozhdenie kazahskih zemel' v sostav Rossii. – 2-e izd., pererab., dop. – Alma-Ata, 1982; Kasymbaev ZH. K. Pod nadezhnuyu zashchitu Rossii. – Alma-Ata, 1986.

26. Suny R. Imperiya kak ona est': imperskaya Rossiya, «nacional'noe» samosoznanie i teoriya imperii // Av Imperio. – Kazan', 2001. – № 1-2. –15.
27. Geoffrey Hosking. Rossiya: narod i imperiya (1552-1917). – Smolensk, 2000.
28. Rieber A. Approaches to empire // Ot mira imperii k globalizacii. – Saratov, 2002. – S. 117-138.
29. Rossijskaya imperiya v sravnitel'noj perspektive. – M., 2004; Novaya imperskaya istoriya postsovestkogo prostranstva. – Kazan', 2004; Rossijskaya imperiya v zarubezhnoj istoriografii. – M., 2005.
30. Kinyapina N.S., Bliev M.M., Degoev V.V. Kavkaz i Srednyaya Aziya vo vneshnej politike Rossii. – M., 1984; Oreshekova S.F., Ul'chenko N.Yu. Rossiya i Turciya (problema formirovaniya granic). – M., 1999.
31. Dik E.N. Vneshnepoliticheskie faktory Rossijskogo imperskogo stroitel'stva // Rossiya v XVIII-XX vv.: Stranicy istorii. K 50-letiyu nauchnoj i pedagogicheskoj deyatel'nosti v Moskovskom universitete zasluzhennogo professora N.S. Kinyapinoj. – M., 2000. – S.248-253.
32. Pavlenko N.I. Petr Velikij. – M., 1990; Vodarskij A.E. Petr I // Voprosy istorii. – 1993. – № 6. Sorokin YU. A.K voprosu o politicheskom haraktere Ekateriny II v 1762-1768 // Istoricheskij ezhegodnik. – 1998. – Omsk, 1999. – S. 5-13; Stegnij P.V. Hroniki vremen Ekateriny II, 1729-1796. – M., 2001; Migunova T.L. Administrativnye reformy Ekateriny Velikoj (istoricheskie predposylki i rezul'taty). – Nizhnij Novgorod, 2001.
33. Kappeler A. Dve tradicii v otnoshenii Rossii k musul'manskim narodam Rossijskoj imperii // Otechestvennaya istoriya. – 2003. – № 2. – S. 129-135; Polunov A. YU. O religii i imperii: missiya, obrashcheniya, veroterpimost' v carskoj Rossii // Tam zhe. – № 5. – S.197-202; Lur'e S.V. Rossijskaya imperiya kak ehtnokul'turnyj fenomen i ehtnopoliticheskaya real'nost' Zakavkaz'ya // Lur'e S.V. metamorfozy tradicionnogo soznaniya. – Spb., 1994; Gatagova L. S. Pravitel'stvennaya politika i narodnoe obrazovanie na Kavkaze v XIX v. – M., 1993.
34. Lieven D. The Russian empire and its rivals. – L., 2000; Suny R. Imperiya kak ona est': imperskaya Rossiya, «nacional'noe» samosoznanie i teoriya imperii // Ab Imperio, 2001. – № 1-2. – S. 9-10; 12-14, 17; Mark Von Hagen. Writing the History of Russia as Empire: The Perspective of Federalism // Kazan', Moskva, Peterburg: Rossijskaya imperiya vzglyadom iz raznyh uglov. – M., 1997. – S. 393-409.
35. Novejshij ehnciklopedicheskij slovar'. – M., 1926-1927: Izdatel'stva P.P. Sojkina; MSEH. – T.3. – M., 1931; BSEH – Izd.1-e. T.28. – M., 1937.
36. Erofeeva I.V. Казахское ханство и власть в традиционном обществе казахов // Masanov N.E., Abylhozhin ZH.B., Erofeeva I.V. idr. Istoriya Kazahstana: narodyi kul'tury: ucheb. posobie. – Almaty: Dajk-Press, 2001.
37. F. Baker III Professor of Russian Studies in the History Department at Harvard University. He is the author of The Affirmative Action Empire: Nations and Nationalism in the USSR, 1923-1939 (Cornell UP, 2001) and co-editor (with Ronald Suny) of A State of Nations: Empire and Nation-Making in the Age of Lenin and Stalin (Oxford UP, 2001). In addition to

questions of nationality and empire, he has written on religion, political and administrative history, Soviet neo-traditionalism, and the political police, as well as the Nazi-Soviet comparison. He is currently completing a book on the politics and sociology of state information-gathering in the USSR from the revolution through the death of Stalin.

38. http://www.amazon.com/Affirmative-Action-Empire-Nationalism-1923-1939/dp/0801486777
39. Terry Martin is the George F. Baker III Professor of Russian Studies in the History Department at Harvard University. He is the author of The Affirmative Action Empire: Nations and Nationalism in the USSR, 1923–1939 (Cornell UP, 2001) and co-editor (with Ronald Suny) of A State of Nations: Empire and Nation-Making in the Age of Lenin and Stalin (Oxford UP, 2001). In addition to questions of nationality and empire, he has written on religion, political and administrative history, Soviet neo-traditionalism, and the political police, as well as the Nazi-Soviet comparison. He is currently completing a book on the politics and sociology of state information-gathering in the USSR from the revolution through the death of Stalin.
40. Francine Hirsch is Associate Professor of History at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. Her interests include Russian and Soviet history, modern European history, and comparative empires. Hirsch is author of Empire of Nations: Ethnographic Knowledge and the Making of the Soviet Union (Cornell University Press, 2005).
41. This part sets out on the basis of Corresponding Member of National Academy of Sciences of Kazakhstan, Laureate of State Award of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Honored worker of science Kenes Nurpeis' article: Pogranichnyj vopros // Kontinent. – №21(34). – 2000. Avaiable: http://www.continent.kz/2000/21/20.html.
42. David R. Shearer Stalinism, 1928-1940 in The Cambridge History of Russia. Vol. III: The Twentieth Century / Edited by R. Suny. – Cambridge University Press. – P. 192.
43. VI Vsekazahskaya konferenciya VKP (b). 15-23 noyabrya 1927 g. Kyzyl-Orda, 1927. S.52-59 // Istoriya Kazahstana s drevnejshih vremen do nashih dnej v pyati tomah. T.4.– Almaty: Atamura, 2010. – P. 335.
44. Mark Harrison is professor of Russian history at the Department of Economics and CAGE, University of Warwick (England).
45. Mark Harrison Soviet Agriculture and Industrialization. Электронный ресурс. Режим доступа: https://www2.warwick.ac.uk/fac/soc /economics /staff/mharrison/public/agriculture 1996.pdf.
46. NiccolòPianciola. Famine in the Steppe. The collectivization of agriculture and the Kazakh herdsmen, 1928-1934. Avaiable: http://monderusse. revues.org/2623?file=1.
47. Prazdnovanie okonchaniya Vtoroj mirovoj vojny v baltijskih stranah. Available at: http://inonewsru.livejournal.com/10184.html. Дата последнего обращения 22 апреля 2016 г.

48. Ukraina vpervye oficial'no nachinaet novuyu tradiciyu otmechaniya 8 i 9 maya v evropejskom duhe pamyati i primireniya. Available at: http://ru.tsn.ua/politika/segodnya-ukraina-otmechaet-den-pamyati-i-primireniya-pochemu-8-maya-i-chto-oznachaet-krasnyy-mak-424512.html.
49. Conflicting memories-Ukrainians and the Second World war – an Examination of the Current State in Historiographical Debate. [Электронный ресурс]. Режим доступа: https://www.academia.edu/4230537/Conflicting_Memories_Ukrainians_and_the_Second_World_War_-_An_Examination_of_the_Current_State_of_Historiographical_Debate.
50. Conflicting memories- Ukrainians and the Second World war – an Examination of the Current State in Historiographical Debate. Available at: https://www.academia.edu/4230537/Conflicting_Memories_Ukrainians_and_the_Second_World_War_-_An_Examination_of_the_Current_State_of_Historiographical_Debate.
51. Vklad Uzbekistana v pobedu vo vtoroj mirovoj vojne. Available at: http://vsemirnaya-istoriya.ru/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=74:vklad-uzbekistana&catid=7: totalitarniy-period&Itemid=2.
52. Great Patriotic War in Belarus. Available at: http://www.belarus.by/en/travel/military-history-tourism/great-patriotic-war-in-belarus.
53. Revelations from the Russian Archives. DEPORTATIONS. 2010. Library of Congress. Accessed April 27. https://www.loc.gov/exhibits/archives/depo.html.
54. Aurélie Campana, The Soviet Massive Deportations – A Chronology, Online Encyclopedia of Mass Violence, [online], published on 5 November 2007, accessed 21 May 2016, URL: http://www.massviolence. org/The-Soviet-massive-deportations-A-chronology, ISSN 1961-9898.
55. Lee, Woosung (2012). The Koreans' migration to the Russian far East and their deportations to Central Asia: from the 1860s to 1937 (Master's thesis, the Russian, East European, and Eurasian Studies Program and the Graduate School of the University of Oregon, USA). Retrieved from https://scholarsbank.uoregon.edu/xmlui/bitstream/handle/1794/12388/Lee_oregon_0171N_10377.pdf?sequence=1.
56. Revelations from the Russian Archives. Deportations. Avaiable at: https://www. loc.gov/exhibits/archives/depo.html.
57. Deportation (1941). The center for Volga-German studies at Concordia University. [online], published on 2 July 2011, accessed 6 May 2016, URL: http://cvgs.cu-portland.edu/history/Deportation.cfm.
58. The Balkars and Karachay are Turkik people who arrived and settled in Central Caucasus around the XII century. Although having their own Turkik languages, they adapted to local Caucasian culture – dressing, dance, customs; also, values like hospitality and honor, prevalent throughout the Caucasus, are essential part of Karachay-Balkar culture. Karachay-Balkar language is divided in 2 dialects: Karachay-Baksan-Chegem and Balkar. The Kumyks, their ethnic cousins who speak the same language live in today's Dagestan. The Balkars live in Kabardino-Balkaria republic, mostly in the high mountainous regions which are also

some of the highest in the world. The Karachay live in neighboring Karachay-Cherkessia, at the foothills of the Caucasus mountains. The Karachays and Balkars are followers of Islam.
59. Aurélie Campana, The Soviet Massive Deportations – A Chronology, Online Encyclopedia of Mass Violence, [online], published on 5 November 2007, accessed 23 May 2016, URL: http://www.massviolence.org/The-Soviet-massive-deportations-A-chronology, ISSN 1961-9898.
60. Steve Swerdlow, Understanding Post-Soviet Ethnic Discrimination and the Effective Use of U.S. Refugee Resettlement: The Case of the Meskhetian Turks of Krasnodar Krai, 94 Cal. L. Rev. 1827 (2006). Available at: http://scholarship.law.berkeley.edu/californialawreview /vol94/iss6/5.
61. Steve Swerdlow, Understanding Post-Soviet Ethnic Discrimination and the Effective Use of U.S. Refugee Resettlement: The Case of the Meskhetian Turks of Krasnodar Krai, 94 Cal. L. Rev. 1827 (2006). Available at: http://scholarship.law.berkeley.edu/californialawreview /vol94/iss6/5.
62. How did Japan and Germany become global powerhouses after WWII? Электронный ресурс. Режим доступа: http://www.japantimes.co.jp/news /2015/08/13/national/history/japan-germany-become-global-powerhouses-wwii/#.Vv4IDeKLRD8.
63. Istoriya Kazahstana s drevnejshih vremen do nashih dnej v pyati tomah. T.4. – Almaty: Atamura, 2010. – P. 539-546.
64. William Taubman The Khrushchev period, 1953-1964 see in The Cambridge history of Russia. Vol.III. The Twentieth Century / Ed. By Ronald Grigor Suny. – Cambridge University press. 2006. – P. 280.
65. Ismail Yusupov: Moya sovest' pered narodom Kazahstana chista. Avaiable at: http://www.nomad.su/?a=15-200404220016.
66. Saktaganova Z.G. D. Kunaev i problemy izmeneniya granic Kazahstana. Avaiable at: rticlekz.com/article/5951.
67. Kozlov V.A. Massovye besporyadki v SSSR pri Hrushcheve i Brezhneve (1953-nachalo 1980-h gg.) / Izdanie tret'e, ispravlennoe i dopolnennoe. – M.: Rospehn, 2009. Avaiable at: http://eland.ru/dirty/kozlov_massovyie _besporiadki_2010.pdf.
68. This chapter was written on the base of chapter «The worsening of environmental problems». See: Istoriya Kazahstana s drevnejshih vremen do nashih dnej v pyati tomah. T.4. – Almaty: Atamura, 2010. – P. 620-630.
69. Masanov N.Eh., Abylhozhin Zh.B., Erofeeva I.V. i dr. Istoriya Kazahstana: narody i kul'tury: Uchebnoe posobie. – Almaty: Dayk-Press, 2001. – S. 355-366; Archie Brown. The Gorbachev era // The Cambridge history of Russia. Vol.III: The Twentieth Century / Ed. By Ronald Grigor Suny. – Cambridge University Press, 2006. – P. 316-351.
70. Archie Brown. The Gorbachev era // The Cambridge history of Russia. Vol.III: The Twentieth Century / Ed. By Ronald Grigor Suny. Cambridge University Press. 2006. – P. 323.

Appendix I

Alexey E. Rogozhinskiy Rock Art Sites in Kazakhstan // Rock Art in Central Asia. A thematic Study November 2011 International Council on Mouments ans Sites Paris France. Edited by Jean Clottes. Retrieved from http://www.icomos.org/world_heritage/TS_CentralAsia_20111220.pdf

Introduction. Kazakhstan is the largest country in Central Asia. The vast steppes, deserts and semi-desert areas of the country's central part are bounded to the west by the Caspian Sea and the Urals, to the north by the forest-steppes of Western Siberia, to the east and south by the mountain belt of the Altai, Tarbagatai, Dzhungarian Alatau and the high ranges of the Northern Tien Shan. Geographical locations, natural resource wealth, diversity of landscapes and climatic conditions, both in the present and in ancient times, determined the special significance of Kazakhstan in the history of the many peoples of Eurasia. Historically and culturally this vast mountain-steppe country has since ancient times played the role of a contact zone, linking civilizations and peoples of the Near East and East Asia, Siberia and Eastern Europe. Rock art sites, along with other historical evidence – written and archaeological- provide rich material for understanding the many processes of cultural development and interaction of peoples of Kazakhstan and neighboring countries in ancient and medieval times. Despite the fact that rock carvings are found today in practically all regions of the country, there are clearly several major zones of concentration of rock art sites: the eastern (Altai, Irtysh and Tarbagatai), central (SaryArka, Ulytau and northern Balkhash region), south, divided into South Kazakhstan (Tau, Talas and Kyrgyz Alatau) and the Semirechensk part (Dzhungarian Tau, Northern Tien-Shan, Chu-Ili mountains). From the perspective of history and geography, the eastern and southern zones have a wider range than is shown by the current political map of the region. Thus, the Kazakhstan Altai sites are inseparable from the Altai-Sayan area of rock art, and the sites of the western edge of the Talas Range and Karatau from those in all of the West Tien Shan region. In western Kazakhstan, rock art sites are relatively few and occur mainly on the Mangyshlak peninsula and Ustyurt plateau with single locations in the Mugodzhary mountains. In northern Kazakhstan rock carvings are not known. Traditionally, Kazakhstan archaeologists divide the petroglyph locations into large, with more than 1000 individual images, and small sites consisting of tens to hundreds of petroglyphs. This classification does not reflect the differences of a cluster of figures from others, but rock art typology in the region has not yet been developed, and we can only use simple statistical calculations and comparisons. Most large and significant locations of petroglyphs are concentrated in the east (Altai, Tarbagatai) and especially in South Kazakhstan (Dzhungarian Alatau, Chu-Ili mountains and Syr Darya Kara-Tau). The sites in these areas are the most studied. Two of them – Arpauzen and Eshkiolme- are potential sites for the World Heritage List and are presented in the Tentative List of Kazakhstan for UNESCO. The Tamgaly petroglyphs were included in the World Heritage List in 2004. Rock Art in

– *Central Asia 10*

– *South Kazakhstan Sites*
– *Semirechye*

Russian sources of the late 18th – early 19th centuries report the name of this historical and geographical region of Central Asia as Zhidysu / Zhetysu (Kazakh for 'seven rivers'). It originally belonged to the south-eastern Near Balkhash region bounded by the northern slope of the Dzhungarian Alatau. Since the second half of the 19th century, the name «Semirechye» has become common with the establishment of the Semirechensk area within administrative boundaries, including all the territory south of Lake Balkhash to the Near Issyk-Kul region, the upper reaches of the Chu River, the delta and middle reaches of the Ili River Valley. According to modern geographical interpretation, the area of Semirechye covers the area between Lakes Balkhash, Sasykol and Alakol in the north, Northern Tien Shan Ranges in the south, Dzhungarian Alatau in the east and the Chu-Ili mountains in the west. It administratively coincides with the Almaty region of Kazakhstan. The largest river of Semirechye -Ili-divides the whole region into the right bank and left bank, into Eastern and Western Semirechye. Sand and salt deserts are common in the northern and north-western plains of Semirechye, and meadow-riparian landscapes are common along rivers. In the Dzhungarian Alatau, foothills and ridges of the Northern Tien Shan (Trans-Ili Alatau, Ketmen, etc.), at an altitude of 2,000 m above sea level, leafy forests are present and transform into pine forests and alpine meadows at a higher altitude. The Dzhungarian Alatau, over 400 km long in the latitudinal direction, consists of two ranges that are distinctly parallel to each other: the northern, or main, and the southern range. The Dzhungarian Alatau system includes several sub-parallel high mountain ranges, accompanied by low and short ranges and their spurs. The absolute heights of the main mountains exceed 4,500 m above sea level. A distinctive feature of the Dzhungarian Alatau is a series of sharp benched slopes, divided into low mountains (700-1600 m), medium lands (1600-3100 m) and highlands (3100-4662 m). Metamorphic shales of the middle and lower Paleozoic play an important role in the structure of the main ridges and front ridges. Paleozoic sandstones and limestones are less common. The foothills consist of sequences of Paleogene, Neogene and Quaternary sediments. The snow line in the Dzhungarian Alatau is located at altitudes of 3,200-3,800. Glaciers and snow, but mainly ground water, feed numerous rivers, which flow from the northern slopes to Lakes Balkhash, Sasykkol and Alakol, and from the southern slopes to the Ili River. The Chu-Ili Mountains stretch for some 200 km from the Zailiy Alatau in a north-westerly direction and are a continuation and completion of the Northern Tien Shan, with whom they share a history of geological development. They form a system of ranges separated by intermontane troughs. The elevation amplitude of the Chu-Ili Mountains is much less than in the Zaili Alatau (about 5,000 m), the highest mountains being Anyrakay (1,180 m), Kulzhabasy (1,178 m) and Khantau (1,024 m). Typical of them are surviving fragments of ancient surface peneplanes, surrounded by steeply sloping low mountains turning into hills on the periphery composed of intrusive and volcanic sedimentary rocks. The axial part of the Chu-Ili mountains forms a watershed of the Chu and Ili rivers. The geologic-geomorphologic and landscape-climatic conditions of Semirechye determine specific features of the topography, number and substrate of rock art sites in the eastern and western part of

the region. Thus, there are no petroglyphs on morainic boulders in the Chu-Ili Mountains, while they are common in Dzhungarian Alatau and the mountains of Northern Tien Shan. In general, the location of the Semirechye petroglyphs in mountainous and steppe Rock Art Sites in Kazakhstan 11 landscapes is on open vertical and/or horizontal rock surfaces in erosion and river valleys traditionally cultivated by settled pastoralists and farmers and nomads of all historic periods. The Dzhungarian Alatau and its multiple spurs are home to numerous locations of petroglyphs concentrated mainly in the low- and mid-hills. The Chu-Ili Mountains have a larger concentration of sites, especially in the central and southern part of the Kazakh Uplands. There are very few known large locations of petroglyphs in Northern Tien Shan, but numerous sites in the mountain valleys of the Zailiyskiy Alatau, Kungey Alatau and Ketmen Range. The total number of the recorded rock art sites in Semirechye now exceeds 50, but the figure increases year after year as archeological research continues and the search coverage widens. In Semirechye rock paintings have not yet been discovered. The predominant technique is pecking, rarely engraving or other techniques. The most common type of substrate, used at different periods to create petroglyphs, were the surfaces of sandstone and siltstones, covered with «desert patina«; fewer drawings were pecked on the patinated surfaces of intrusive rocks. In Semirechye, there is a concentration of several major locations of petroglyphs, the study of which has lasted for decades and served as the basis for the development of modern schemes of periodization of Kazakhstan rock art. The oldest petroglyphs are dated to different stages of the Bronze Age (2nd millennium BC) and identification of more ancient groups of images has not yet been possible. Pictorial traditions of the Early Iron Age (1st millennium BC – 5th century AD) and the Middle Ages (6th-7th centuries) are well represented. No carvings are dated to the PostMongolian period (13th-16th centuries). Petroglyphs of Late Middle Ages and modernity (17th-20th centuries) have been poorly studied; they are often associated with epigraphy and tribal signs (tamgas) of nomads of Western Mongolian and Turkic origin. Petroglyphs and inscriptions relating to the current stage of development of traditional rock art are notable everywhere. The most expressive, abundant and widely spread Semirechye rock art is that of the Bronze Age, in almost all areas. It is generally characterized by a relatively homogeneous repertoire of images (anthropomorphic, zoomorphic and signs), similar style, iconography and technique of execution. There may, however, be chronological, territorial, and, probably, cultural differences in Eastern and Western Semirechye. A representative series of petroglyphs dating to the first half of the 2nd century BC is notable in the Kulzhabasy Complex (south of the Chu-Ili Mountains). They are characterized by the dominance of isolated contour images of large size (up to 1-1.5 m) of wild oxen and panels where four-wheeled carts are associated with bulls or camels. They are chronologically followed by Tamgaly type petroglyphs, most vividly represented at the eponymous site, with more variety of zoomorphic and anthropomorphic images, with solar characters («sun-headed») and other chimerical composite figures, as well as horse-drawn chariots. This unique series of petroglyphs is dated to the 14th –13th centuries BC. In addition, Late Bronze Age petroglyphs, distinguished by a simple interpretation of small size figures, with a predominance of pastoral, battle and hunting motifs, with an almost complete absence of the

syncretic images present in the art of the early stages, are notable in the Chu-Ili mountains and the western part of the Trans-Ili Alatau. Several groups of petroglyphs of different ages dating back to the Late Bronze Age in Eastern Semirechye are also notable; earlier images such as those in the Chu-Ili Mountains are absent. The largest known and studied petroglyph location in Kazakhstan's Dzhungarian Alatau-Eshkiolmes – is characterized by a great variety of styles and a rich repertoire of engravings from the Bronze Age, with at least three stylistic groups of drawings, dating back to the 13th-9th centuries BC and analogous to the Late Bronze petroglyphs in Western Semirechye. Rock Art in Central Asia 12 Early Iron Age rock art traditions in Semirechye, also predominant in Eshkiolmes, are the Pre-Saki and Early Saki petroglyphs (8th-6th centuries BC). They are characterized by the prominent role of the wild fauna represented -felines, wolves, boar, deer, mountain goats, as well as birds of prey. The abundant art of the Pazyryk culture is characterized by the leading role of human images – mounted and dismounted soldiers armed with bows, battle axes, daggers or swords, and a birthing woman occupying an almost central position in this art. The iconography includes hunting scenes and animals torn to pieces, with body or head 180° reversed. These petroglyphs are dated to the 5th-3rd centuries BC. In Western Semirechye, another pictorial tradition includes images of mirrors with a handle (often life-size), dated by means of their similarity to real objects. It is typical of the nomad culture of western Kazakhstan, the Near Urals and the Dzhetyasar culture of the lower reaches of the Syrdarya (6th-4th/3rd centuries BC). In addition, large numbers of less expressive engravings, not yet attributed to a particular culture, date to the Early Iron Age. In particular, in Eastern Semirechye, it has so far been impossible to confidently distinguish petroglyphs from the end of the 1st millennium BC to the beginning of our era, whereas in the Chu-Ili Mountains (Kulzhabasy, Tamgaly) representative series of petroglyphs are similar to the objects in the Hunnu and Syanbi arts. Petroglyphs of the ancient Turkic period (6th-8th centuries) and the Advanced Middle Ages (9th-12th centuries) belong to a uniform pictorial tradition, different in style, with images of dated armor and equipment, epigraphy and tribal signs (tamgas). Their repertoire is dominated by mounted warriors (often with banners), hunting scenes and other motifs which may retain features of the animal art of the preceding period. The most vivid examples of medieval rock art in the east of Semirechye are at Eshkiolmes and Bayanzhurek, and on the left bank of the river Ili -in Tamgaly, Kulzhabasy, Akkaynar, Akterek, Oh-dzhaylyau, among others. The rock art of the Oirat tribes that lived in Semirechye in the 17th and the first half of the 18th centuries, remains poorly studied. It is mostly represented by cultic Tibetan and Oirat epigraphy (Kegen Arasan, Taygak), sometimes accompanied by pictures of Lamaist-pantheon characters (Tamgalytas, Akkaynar), tamgas, and less frequently by pictures of animals and humans (Kulzhabasy). The most recent petroglyphs were made by nomadic Kazakhs in the 19th – early 20th century. Their repertoire is limited to hunting motifs, horse races or cattle grazing, with inscriptions in Arabic script, graffiti and images of lineage – tamgas-close to wintering grounds. They rarely form significant concentrations, but in general are widespread and fairly abundant. The content and form of 20th century rock art differs, with Cyrillic graffiti and Soviet-era ideological symbols: portraits of V.I. Lenin, the five-pointed star,

emblems of arms of the Soviet Army and others. The traditional motifs of hunting, stunts on horseback and others persist. The study of the Semirechye archaeological sites began in the second half of the 19th century, but especially active and systematic research started in the 1950's and continues today. The least studied are Stone Age sites, known mostly from collections of Mesolithic and Neolithic artifacts in the Chu-Ili Mountains (Khantau, Kulzhabasy, Tamgaly, Anyrakay), the foothills of the Tien Shan and in the Dzhungarian Alatau. In the foothills of the Zailiyskiy Alatau, the Mesolithic stratigraphy of Maybulak was studied. Sites of the Chalcolithic and Early Bronze Age have not yet been identified, but in the Chu-Ili and Dzhungarian Alatau mountains is isolated evidence of stone, bronze and ceramic pottery dating back to the time that preceded the development of the Andronovo culturalhistorical community. Bronze Age settlements and burials were studied throughout Semirechye, including where petroglyphs are located. The most famous sites -mainly in Eastern Semirechye – Rock Art Sites in Kazakhstan 13 belong to «mixed» types (Semirechye, Kulsay), reflecting a significant impact in the 14th-13th centuries BC, in Western Semirechye, of the Atasus (Alakul) variant of the Bronze Age culture of Central Kazakhstan and cultures of Southern Siberia in the 13t-10th centuries BC. The culture of 1st millennium BC nomads is mainly known from numerous burial mounds, excavated in the past but far from entirely published. Early Iron Age dwelling sites and settlements are recorded everywhere, but only a few sites in the foothills of the Zailiy Alatau, Chu-Ili mountains and Dzhungarian Alatau have been excavated. The piedmont area of the Northern Tien Shan is famous because of the treasures found there, which include bronze pots, altars, and other items. The Medieval period is characterized by the coexistence of an urban agricultural culture, represented by a large number of towns and rural settlements, and the nomadic culture, much represented by funerary sites and memorials with stone sculptures. Modern sites of nomadic encampments from the 18th to the early 20th centuries were found everywhere but not systematically studied. In general, the present state of knowledge of archeological sites in Semirechye, although still insufficient to address some questions of ancient history, allows rock art to be considered in the context of the overall development of the region's cultures. An integrated approach has been used since the 1980's to explore many rock art sites in Semirechye (Tamgaly, Kulzhabasy, Eshkiolmes) along with study of other archaeological objects in their cultural landscape. Although some indigenous pastoralists in Semirechye still practice rock drawings and inscriptions, their activity has no religious or cultural value. At the same time, some of the rock art sites within their area are included within the sacred space recognized by tradition as holy places (Tamgaly, Kegen Arasan). However, even then, the main objects of worship are other cultural or natural sites, i.e. burial places, cultic buildings, trees, springs, rather than ancient petroglyphs. With few exceptions, the awareness of local people of their value remains minimal, thus giving rise to a negligent attitude towards them, deliberate destruction or retouching of the engravings, the creation of palimpsests, etc. The Most Important Sites in Semirechye.

Tamgaly

Location. Tamgaly Gorge is situated 17 km north-west of Almaty City, 4 km north of Karabastau Village, in the south-eastern part of the Chu-Ili Mountains. The

geographical area belongs to the arid desert zone with an extreme continental climate. The few rivers often dry up in the summer, the main ones being the Tamgaly and the Oysu, right tributaries of the Ashysu River. Rare plant species in the Chu-Ili Mountains are listed in the Red Data Book of Kazakhstan. Wild animals include wolves, foxes, rabbits, turtles, snakes, and many birds, including steppe eagle, falcon, saker falcons. Neotectonic movements played a major role in shaping the picturesque landscape of Tamgaly. Mountain borders and a broad plain to the north are along a seismic fault which lifted the surface and formed a high ledge, while water- and wind-erosion formed a network of river valleys and upland relief. A striking feature of Tamgaly Valley is a small canyon at the mouth of the gorge. Rocky slopes almost converge there on the contours of the valley. Wide and smooth rock surfaces are covered with dense «desert patina» and served as a perfect background for numerous petroglyphs.

Archeological Context. There are more than 100 different sites -settlements, burial grounds, altars, and concentrations of petroglyphs within a territory of about 900 hectares, dated from the middle of the 14th-13th centuries BC until the turn of the 19th-20th centuries AD. The settlements are located exclusively in the mountainous part of the gorge. They occupy a small area (300-1,200m2) in different geomorphic conditions. Many are multi-layered sites containing Rock Art in Central Asia 14 cultural relics of several historical eras. Excavations were carried out on the settlements called Tamgaly I and V. The stratigraphy of Tamgaly I includes cultural layers of four historical periods: Late Bronze Age (12th-10th centuries BC), Early Iron Age (two stages: 6th/5th to 4th centuries BC; 2nd century BC to 1st century AD), as well as the late Middle Ages (16th-17th centuries) and modernity (19th – 20th centuries). For the different layers of the settlement we have more than a dozen 14C and ESR dates. Building stones with petroglyphs were found in the cultural layers; the most representative series of images was dated to the turn of the 5th-4th centuries BC. Ancient burial sites are located in the mountainous and plain parts of Tamgaly Gorge. Bronze Age burials at Tamgaly I, II and Karakuduk II were excavated in the piedmont plain. The mountainous area contains Tamgaly IV-VII burials. Sites typologically belong to the Atasus and Semirechye versions of the Andronovo cultural-historical community and date from the 14th/13th to the 10th centuries BC. Kurgan burial mounds, everywhere in the gorge, present several types from the features of mounds and burial structures. The largest burial grounds (two or three dozen burials) are located on the piedmont plain. The burial sites investigated by Maksimova A.-G. in 1957 are dated to the 3rd century BC – 2nd century AD. A mound with stone-revetments is especially notable. A mound with a burial from the 5th-4th centuries BC was researched at Tamgaly VI. Three ritual ring fences with a «deer» stone inside one of them were identified in Karakuduk II dating to the 5th – 4th centuries BC. Medieval burials in Tamgaly are absent. Ancient quarries were found near Bronze Age burial sites at Tamgaly I, II and VI. The core of the complex is Tamgaly Canyon, with about 3,000 petroglyphs, tentatively marked as groups I-IV; the total number of rock carvings including the peripheral locations is about 5,000 pictures. Typology and Dating. Tamgaly Bronze Age petroglyphs are unique in Central Asian rock art. The oldest series of rock images identified as the Tamgaly-type of petroglyphs has the most aesthetic and cultural value. They are

distinguished by their large-size (from 25-30 cm to 0.7-1.0 m), vivid naturalistic style and their rich repertoire (anthropomorphic solar deities, «masks», club-carriers, an archer in a wolf mask, chariots, hoof prints, spectacle-shaped signs as well as images of bulls, Asiatic wild asses, horses, camels, wild boar, wolves, deer, etc.). A masterpiece of prehistoric rock art is a vertical panel (group IV, site 118) with images of 6-7 solar characters, ten dancing male warriors with weapons, birthing women, erotic scenes and «worshippers». On the panel, there is a kind of hierarchy with three groups of characters: the highest level is occupied by solar deities; below them are a series of similar figures of dancers and birthing women and a «worshipper» at the bottom. Solitary images of different «sun-headed» types also exist in Tamgaly groups II, III, IV and V, but only in the former place are all the solar characters united in a single panel which allows us to consider it as an image of the pantheon. In Tamgaly, out of a total of 30 «sun-headed» images recorded, 26 still remain. Tamgaly-type petroglyphs are distributed unevenly throughout the area of the gorge, mainly on the rocks in groups I-V, IVa, with more than 1,000 isolated images, also found in several peripheral locations of the Tamgaly complex, dated to the second half of the 14th-13th centuries BC. Their area is limited from the central part of the Chu-Ili Mountains to the Chu Valley and the northern Issyk-Kul region. Late Bronze Age (12th-10th centuries BC) petroglyphs are outnumbered by the drawings of previous periods and differ significantly from them in technique, style, repertoire, localization within the Tamgaly complex. Their repertoire looks poorer, with images of horses, bulls and wild animals Rock Art Sites in Kazakhstan 15 being prominent; complex, syncretic images become rare. Images from the transitional period from the Bronze Age to the Early Iron Age (beginning of the 1st millennium BC) form a particular small group. Almost no human figures are present, giving way to stylized images of deer, wild goat, and predators – wolves, wild boar, panthers. Their artistic style and compositional arrangement, due to the choice of vertical stelae-shaped planes, connect these petroglyphs with the pictorial tradition of Western Mongolia and Altai «deer» stones. Images of the Early Iron Age form the largest group of Tamgaly petroglyphs. They are mainly concentrated in groups IV and V and at the periphery of the complex-everywhere around the settlements, burial mounds and on hill tops. A remarkable series includes images of wild animals in the Saki animal style – a specific artistic style of Central Asian Animalism of the 6th-4th centuries BC. Their appearance is connected to the massive retouching of Bronze Age drawings in groups III-V, where Saki petroglyphs are often clumsily carved onto ancient images. In addition, a huge amount of non-realistic engravings exist on the Tamgaly rocks. Petroglyphs dating to the Middle Ages are everywhere, although their total number is relatively small. On canyon rocks, they prevail in groups IV and V, but the best examples are presented in several peripheral locations along the main roads and mountain trails of a gorge. Medieval engravings with a special repertoire and artistic originality were made by Central Asian nomads (6th-12th centuries). The main character of the panels is a mounted horseman – standard bearer, archer, or a heavily armed warrior. New pictorial motifs include a duel between mounted and dismounted warriors, hunting scenes, migrations. With few exceptions, the drawings were pecked superficially and many images incised with a sharp metal tool. Massive re-carving of

ancient drawings becomes popular, with the addition of new elements changing the original content of images. A striking example is the image of a bull from the Bronze Age (III group, Site 23) transformed into the figure of a rider. A large image of an elephant with a rider near the settlement of Tamgaly I, and the figure of a seated anthropomorphic character (deity?) in group V, resembling the early medieval frescoes of Sogdiana, are rare in Central Asian rock art. A special category of engravings includes ancient Turkic tamgas -signs of tribal affiliation and tribal property. There is also a short runic inscription dated to the 9th-10th centuries. An Oirat inscription on the rocks of group IV depicting a six-syllable mantra «om ma ni pad me hum» is dated to the last decades of the 17th – middle of the 18th centuries. Kazakh folk-images from the 19th – early 20th centuries show the last attempts at rock art. Limited to images of goats, horses and horse riders, they are mostly found near the wintering grounds of settlements; lineage tamgas are often depicted along with figures of people and animals. The special cultural significance of the Tamgaly complex is due to a number of specific features. Many pictorial traditions typical of Kazakhstan and Central Asian rock art are concentrated there. The petroglyphs and other Tamgaly sites illustrate the evolution of the subjects and forms of rock art over three millennia against the background of the historical development of nomadic cultures in the arid zone of Central Asia.

Research Status and Documentation. Rock drawings and some Tamgaly sites were discovered for the first time in 1957 by Maximova A.G. (Semirechye's Party of Southern Kazakhstan Expedition from the Institute of History, Archeology, and Ethnography of AS of the KazSSR). Geologists Medoev A.G. and Aubekerov B. Zh., archaeologists Maryashev A.N., Yermolaeva A.S. researched the site in the 1970-1980's. Rogozhinsky A.E. researched it in 1988-2005. In 1990-1994, the «Kazproektrestavratsiya» Institute initiated a comprehensive archeological – Rock Art in Central Asia 16 geomorphologic research and preservation of petroglyphs, continued in 1998-2005 by KazIRP MMC (Rogozhinsky A.E., Aubekerov B.Zh., Ripinskaya E.N., Charlina L.F., Horosh E.H.), in partnership in 2002-2005 with A.S. Higen (Riksantikvaren, Norway) and support from UNESCO. Since 2001, Tamgaly has been on the State List of Sites of National Importance of Kazakhstan. In 2003, the State Historical-Cultural and Natural Preserve «Tamgaly» was created. In 2004, the petroglyphs of Tamgaly archeological landscape were included in UNESCO's World Heritage List (Rogozhinsky et al. 2004).

Kulzhabasy

Location. The Kulzhabasy Mountains are located in the Korday District of the Zhambyl Region, 200 km west-north-west of Almaty City, 30 km from Otar Station, in the south-western part of the Chu-Ili Mountains, where the wide Kopa Valley separates the southern end of the range from the central Anyrakay massif. The northern part of the mountains is a dry plateau. The southern slopes are cut across by erosion valleys, some of which are 2-3 km long. The range is divided by a depression into eastern and western halves that is higher and has many springs as well as rock outcroppings with patinated surfaces which have been used for carving petroglyphs. Research Status and Documentation. First information on rock art in the Kulzhabasy Mountains was reported in 1961 by regional ethnographer-zoologist, Markovskiy P.I., who surveyed several gorges in the western part of the mountains.

The main location of petroglyphs was discovered in 2002 by Sala R. and in 2003-2004 examined by expeditions of the Institute of Archeology of NAS of the RK (Maryashev A.N.) and Research and Design Institute of Sites of Material Culture (Rogozhinskiy A.E.). In 2005-2009, Rogozhinskiy (Kazakh Scientific Research Institute on Problems of the Cultural Heritage of Nomads (KazSRI-Nomads)) continued documenting and researching the petroglyphs. This research helped identify their main locations and over 100 sites of other types concentrated in more than 10 gorges within the Kulzhabasy Range. An archeological map was made, with indexed panoramas of the main concentrations of drawings. Archeological excavations were carried out on three burial sites dated to the Bronze Age and on two dwelling sites. Typology and dating of petroglyphs in Kulzhaasy was for the first time suggested by Sala R. and further developed by Rogozhinskiy (Rogozhinskiy et al. 2004).

Archeological Context. The archeological landscape of Kulzhabasy covers a narrow strip of foothills and short mountain valleys (approximately 2x30 km). Several dozens of dwelling sites from different periods were identified in the mountain valleys of Kulzhabasy. Galleries of petroglyphs appeared in the vicinity of dwelling sites on the rocky slopes of gorges, the most important of which are concentrated in four central valleys. In the piedmont plain, small groups of graves or entire necropoli with burials are attributed to the Bronze Age; they are in stone boxes and cists, with a chain of kurgans of early nomads, dated to the Middle Ages, with ritual fences and statues inside, as well as Kazakh familial-tribal burial vaults and mausoleums dated to the 18th-19th centuries. Sites of the latest period are represented by the remnants of multiple wintering grounds, small cleared and fenced areas of plow-land and a relatively small number of petroglyphs and triballineage tamgas. Beginning in the 1930's, the nomad population in Kulzhabasy sharply dropped. Excavated material attributed to the Bronze Age burials at Kylzhabasy III, V and VI can be compared to that found at other sites in the Chu-Ili Mountains (Tamgaly, Oy-Dzhaylau, Kozha-Bala) and Semirechye, dated to no earlier than the 14th-13th centuries BC. Typology and Dating. Petroglyphs represent the most valuable and informative part of the Kulzhabasy sites. Several series chronologically precede the Late Bronze Age engravings strikingly represented at Tamgaly and other sites in Semirechye. The earliest ones are concentrated in three central gorges and include dozens of contour drawings of oxen with long curved horns. Animal figures are pecked superficially and are often overlaid by later engravings similar to those of the Rock Art Sites in Kazakhstan 17 Tamgaly-type (14th-13th centuries BC) and probably date to the first half of the 2nd millennium BC or earlier. This is especially important, since the genesis of Tamgaly-type petroglyphs suggests a synthesis of the pictorial traditions of the Andronovo tribes in Southern Saryarka (Central Kazakhstan) and certain indigenous groups in Western Semirechye, whose origin is still unclear. The Kulzhabasy Bronze Age petroglyphs have a specific repertoire, iconography and pictorial style. Their repertoire is dominated by depictions of bulls, whose body frame is often adorned with parallel lines or grids; there also are four-wheeled carts on solid wheels, harnessed to bulls and people steering camels. Humans are depicted naturalistically in a unique manner (body facing forward and legs shown in profile), which characterizes the Bronze Age petroglyphs in the

Karatau Mountains (Southern Kazakhstan), Bukantau and Zaravshan Valley (Uzbekistan). Rare depictions are analogous to the most ancient Tamgaly petroglyphs: archers wearing animal (wolf?) masks, «sun-headed» personages and others. This allows identification of the settlement area of Bronze Age tribes within the Chu-Ili Mountains whose environment influenced a pictorial tradition of Tamgaly-type petroglyphs in the second half of the 2nd millennium BC. Probably, earlier engravings in Kulzhabasy demonstrate an initial stage of this cultural process which culminated with Tamgaly. Kulzhabasy Late Bronze Age petroglyphs demonstrate a diversity of styles reflecting a multicomponent composition of the population in Western Semirechye at the end of the 2nd millennium BC. Particularly remarkable at that time is the depiction of realistic objects on rocks – knives, women's jewelry and adornments – comparable to Late Bronze Age artifacts. This allows the dating of petroglyphs and identifying of broad cultural relations of the ancient Semirechye population. Thus, depictions of mirrors with jutting handles are analogous to bronze articles from treasure troves in the Chu Valley (Shamshi, Sadovoye, Sukuluk, and Koytin) of the 12th-9th centuries BC and foundry moulds from ancient farming settlements of the Chust Culture in Fergana. A depiction of a knife, whose prototypes were common in the 13th-9th centuries BC among forest and steppe dwellers of the Tomsk Near Ob area, indicates more remote relations with Semirechye. Perhaps, the frequent depictions of prestigious metal artifacts on the Kulzhabasy rocks and other sites in the Chu-Ili Mountains reflect an important role of those ancient roads that connected the populations of Semireche and the Near Issykkul area with the large copper deposits in Saryarka. This «corridor» of steppe communications acquires even more importance in the 1st millennium BC, when, along with the traditional motifs of Saki animalists in Kulzhabasy, emerges the artwork of ancient nomads, whose «traces» are found from the Urals to the lower reaches of Syrdayra to the Altai and Sayan. The best petroglyphs of this period are concentrated in the eastern part of the Kulzhabasy complex where a remarkable gallery was created on rocks free from petroglyphs of earlier periods. Several vertical and inclined surfaces, so located that many engravings can be seen at one glance from a distance of 10-15 m, represent a kind of «triptych». The foreground scene features a group: two warriors – one with a short sword and a dagger, another with a battle axe and a shield – face left; their profiles show their facial features (chin, nose, high forehead), hairstyle and a tall head-dress with a rounded top. Their body proportions are noticeably distorted and their pose is that of riders without stirrups on invisible horses. A little to the left, on a second surface are several large figures : a horse galloping to the right towards the warriors, a mirror with a long handle with a coin-shaped tip, and an unidentified contour-drawn figure resembling the head of a chimerical griffon. Finally, the centerpiece of the «triptych» is a complex composition that includes several expressive scenes: two horses standing by a sacrificial pole or a schematically-depicted tree; a child delivery scene – a pregnant woman stretching her arms towards a cauldron and a person kneeling in front of her and holding with one hand the leg of the woman in labor and holding a knife (?) to her large abdomen in his other hand; another person, depicted to the left of the woman in labor, is holding her by her shoulders. Other engravings depict shooting archers, people leading camels on a leash and others. Rock Art in Central

Asia 18 To the right of the panel, on a white quartz rock imbedded in sandstone, there is another pecked depiction of a mirror with a long handle expanding towards the tip. The series of these images is unique and executed with a mastery and realism rare for rock art, thus revealing their creators' familiarity with the best works of Asian nomadic pictorial art and, possibly, the Middle Eastern civi lization of the 1st century BC. The entire collection of realistic objects depicted – a cauldron with vertical handles on a conical tray, a battle axe with a bolt, a small rectangular shield and a short sword, dagger, and a head-dress of a unique shape – are more often found beyond Semirechye: in the north-east – in the nomadic cultures of Tuva, Altai, Minusinsk Basin in the period of 6th-4th centuries BC, and in the north-west in the material culture of the Savromats and Sarmats of Zauralye. The rare occurrence of this series of petroglyphs in Kulzhabasy and in the Chu-Ili Mountains testifies to the short presence of these tribes who left such remarkable works of rock art. Another series of petroglyphs concentrated near an ancient dwelling site stands out: scenes depicting mounted archers hunting goats and deer, humans attired in kaftans and baggy trousers, and others, including three mythical animals resembling «unicorns» known on toreutikh items and in Southern Siberian petroglyphs, related to the Hsienbi culture of the first centuries of our Era. Medieval petroglyphs in Kulzhabasy are relatively few, but include expressive scenes with confrontations of archers on foot with a mounted standard bearer, a cavalcade of riders with banners, wild sheep hunting and other scenes traditional for the period, with many tribal tamga and runic inscriptions. Very few Kulzhabasy petroglyphs are modern: Oirat tamgas and depictions of people wearing kaftans resembling traditional Kalmyk garments. The Oirats were present in Western Semirechye at the end of 17th – first half of the 18th centuries. Kazakh petroglyphs, Arabic inscriptions and tamgas often occur on rocks near wintering grounds of the 19th and early 20th centuries. Sholakzhideli

Location. Sholakzhideli Gorge is located in the Shu District of the Zhambyl Region, 5 km east of Khantau Station on the western slope of the Khantau Mountains. The Low Khantau and Zhambyl Mountains form the northern end of the Chu-Ili Range. That area is surrounded by almost impassable deserts (Moyinkum, Begapdala and Taukum), to the west, north, and east. For more than three millennia, it thus had a special significance in the system of interregional communications, cultural, economic, political ties and relations. The routes historically connecting Eastern Europe and Western Siberia, Central Asia, Internal Tien Shan and China met there. Until the middle of the 19th century, trade caravans from Bukhara and Tashkent stopped to rest before continuing their journey through the desert to the shores of the Balkhash and farther on to Irtysh and Tobol. The strategic main road – Big Kalmy Road that connected the nomadic headquarters (urgu) of the rulers of the Dzhungarian Khanate and Tibet with the Volga Kalmyks – led from there to the Volga through the Kazakh Steppe. The Khantau archeological sites testify to the significance of the Semirechye area in Antiquity. Research Status and Documentation. Research on Khantau archeological sites is incomplete. Some sites with petroglyphs were discovered in the 1970's and 1980's by geologists Medoev A.G., Volobuev V.I., historians and regional ethnographers Zholdasbaev S. and Baybosynov K. Archeologist Ismagilov R.-B. only excavated burial grounds dating to the Bronze Age in Kozhabala. The most researched type of site is still rock

art. In 1994, a French-Kazakh Expedition (Francfort H.P. & Samashev Z.) surveyed petroglyphs in the Sholakzhideli Gorge. In 2007 and 2009, an expedition from the KazSRI-Nomads carried out archeological exploration in the Khantau Mountains and documented petroglyphs in the Zholakzhideli Gorge. They made a map of the surveyed area, indexed Sholakzhideli Canyon, photographed surfaces with petroglyphs, and made contact copies of some of them. Rock Art Sites in Kazakhstan 19 Archeological Context. Khantau is a large mountain massif mainly consisting of granites and eruptive rocks. Several valleys are parallel along the south-western slope. The largest of them – Sunkarsay, Ulkentaldy, Sholakzhideli and Terekty – begin as wide water-drainage funnels and form deep and narrow gorges in their openings that served as an ideal environment for rock art galleries. As a rule, dwelling sites of the Neolithic and later periods including the Middle Ages are located in the upper part of the valleys near the estuaries of small rivers and springs. Frequent discoveries of ornamented pottery made with a potter's wheel point to the close ties of 9th and 10th centuries AD nomads with the settlements of non-migratory populations and cities in the Chu Valley. Small groups of kurgans of early and medieval nomads were left in the piedmont area, but the largest cemeteries are concentrated in the southern foothills of Mount Sunkar. Groups of funerary fences built with 7/8 boulders stretch in a line along chains of kurgans. Judging from their appearance, these fenced kurgan burial sites resemble Altai sites dated to the Pazyryk Culture of the Scythian Period.1 Ancient Turkic stone fences and statues were found in hill sites of intermontane areas. The Kozhabala burial site on the north-eastern slope of Mount Sunkar is the most ancient explored site at Khantau. A total of 150 burials are represented by fenced rectangular or roundish stone structures. Excavated graves yielded cremated remains and a body with ornate pottery and bronze jewelry (bracelets, pendants, bead necklaces). The burial site, dated to the 13th century BC, is attributed to the mixed type of sites of the Andronovo cultural and historical community common in the south of Saryarka and Western Semirechye. As at other Bronze Age burials in the Chu-Ili Mountains (Tamgaly I, Oy-Dzhaylau III), the Kozhabala necropolis records the history of steppe tribes in Central Kazakhstan and all the way to the foothills of Tien Shan in the last third of the 2nd millennium BC. Typology and Dating. The most ancient petroglyphs in Khantau's mountainous valleys are dated to the Bronze Age. They also include engravings very typical of the Northern Near Balkhash Area rock art by repertoire and style and Bronze Age petroglyphs common in other parts of Semirechye. The most remarkable Khantau petroglyphs include engravings dating to the middle of the 1st millennium BC, most of which are unique or rare, specific to the Chu-Ili Mountains and belonging to the period of early nomads. The largest location of petroglyphs in Khantau is Sholakzhideli. Most are concentrated on the right slope of a small canyon at the mouth of the valley. The rock massif is formed by alternating rows of erosion terraces that resemble high steps that make the canyon look like an antique theater. All rocks are covered with «desert patina», but horizontal surfaces, where most petroglyphs are carved, had the best qualities for rock art. Therefore, one can see the images only when ascending the slope or standing at the edge of a ledge. This is a specific feature of Sholakzhideli rock art that distinguishes it from all other known sites in the Khantau and Chu-Ili

Mountains. The canyon contains petroglyphs of the Bronze and Early Iron Ages, while the most ancient images cover only a few wide surfaces; the remaining surfaces were used by artists of the Saki Period. Medieval petroglyphs and recarvings of ancient images are few, so most early engravings are in a good state of preservation. There are about 2,000 petroglyphs in all. Images of horses, bulls, camels and a chariot are dated to the Bronze Age; a two-wheeled chariot is shown schematically without draft animals. They differ only slightly and were apparently created within one period. They also include several artfully carved images, thematically quite similar. A remarkable scene in the upper tier of the canyon is that of a battle between two stallions on their hind legs. 1 В.Д.Кубарев. Курганы Юстыда. Новосибирск. 1991. С. 23-24. Рис. 3; К.Ш. Табалдиев. «Восьмикаменные» оградки, «поминальники» ранних кочевых племен Тянь-Шаня. – Кыргызстан: история и современность. Бишкек. 2006. С. 267-275. Rock Art in Central Asia 20 Petroglyphs of the Saki Period, in a majority in the canyon, are often carved on the same surfaces, while in some cases they overlap Bronze Age images. In general, the layer of petroglyphs is heterogeneous, with earlier and later series of images while some images are superimposed in some compositions. Engravings of the Early Saki Animalistic style are characterized by a unique manner of depicting wild animals – herbivores and predators. However, the overall background of the gallery consists of a different pictorial tradition with some elements of animalistic style, but it loses the plasticity intrinsic to the Early Saki art and shows a noticeable prevalence of ornamental elements. Contour images of animals, whose body frame is filled with various lines, scrolls, and other ornamental figures, are dominant. Laced animals clumsily overlap Bronze Age and Saki engravings, which shows a shift in the artistic traditions of the second half of the 2nd millennium BC. They include a unique image of a deer with tree-like antlers and shapes on its back that resemble wings. In general, this series of petroglyphs is similar to those found far in the north-east, in the art of the Tagarian tribes of the Middle Yenisei and Pazyryk Culture of the Altai as well as that of some other sites in the Chu-Ili Mountains (Anyrakay, Tamgaly) and in the Near Issyk Kul Area (CholponAta). This said, the Sholakzhideli petroglyphs represent the largest series of drawings of this type in the Chu-Ili Mountains. Petroglyphs also include tamga-like signs of two types also found in other rock art locations in Central Asia (Altai, Tuva, and Mongolia). Another rare category of engravings includes mirrors, on several sites scattered along the Chu-Ili mountains from Kulzhabasy in the south to Khantau in the north. Out of five mirrors with a straight protruding handle carved on one surface at Sholakzhideli, four are depicted with life-size proportions, shapes and sizes. Their comparison with dated artifacts gives a probable age for the petroglyphs and indicates the historic and cultural contacts of early nomads in Semirechye, all the more as depictions of mirrors do not occur, for example, in the Dzhungarian Alatau. At the same time, solar images of mirrors with protruding handles are known on sites of the Mountainous Altai (Kalbak-Tash). Thus, the engraved mirrors, together with other discoveries and sites in the Chu-Ili Mountains, reflect the special historical significance of this geographical region in the system of ancient communications through Western Semirechye. Modern petroglyphs – lineage tamgas of Kazakhs of the Great Juz (Senior Horde nomads) of the Dulat tribe- were

found in the Sholakzhideli and Zhideli Gorges in the vicinity of several dwelling sites dated to the last third of the 19th century. As in other areas of Semirechye, due to a scarcity of land, these signs certified lineage property rights for the most conveniently-located nomadic wintering grounds. Eshkiolmes Location. The Eshkiolmes Mountains are spurs of the main range of the Dzhungarian Alatau 15 km south of Taldykorgan City – an administrative capital of the Almaty Region. The specificity of the natural structure of low range Eshkiolmes (850 – 1,300 m) is its asymmetry: the northern slopes consist of smooth hillsides in a gently rolling country covered with grassland vegetation; the southern slope is steep and represents a chain of deep and narrow rocky gorges. Devonian eruptive and sedimentary formations shape the geological structure of the mountains. It is on these patinated Devonian rocks that numerous petroglyphs are preserved. Research Status and Documentation. Information about Eshkiolmes Mountains rock engravings was reported by a geologist Skrynnik L., and in 1982, an expedition from the Kazakh Pedagogy Institute led by Maryashev A.N. carried out the first research on petroglyphs and the excavations of burial sites in the foothills. During the following twenty years, the sites of Eshkiolmes were researched by Maryashev A.N. (in 1982-1988 in partnership with Rogozhinskiy A.E.) and Goryachev A.A. Rock Art Sites in Kazakhstan 21 In 2003-2005, an expedition from KazIRP MMC led by Rogozhinskiy A.E. explored and recorded the Eshkiolmes sites, mapping the complex, determining boundaries and the protection zone of the site in order to file for state registration, and documentation of the main locations of petroglyphs (Rogozhinskiy et al. 2004). The site is on the State List of Historic and Cultural Sites of Kazakhstan of National Importance and the UNESCO Tentative List, but the protection zone has not yet been approved and no physical protection or management have been provided yet. Archeological Context. «Eshkiolmes», a name common in the toponymy of Kazakhstan, means «a goat won't die (from starvation)». Kazakh cattle breeders usually give this name to a locale rich in year-round pasture. Out of two groups of Bronze Age sites in the foothills of Eshkiolmes, one is dated from the 13th to the 12th century BC (Talapty I settlement, Talapty burial sites I and II, III, Kuygan II) and the other to the 12th and 10th/9th centuries BC (Talapty settlements I, Kuygan I, II and Kuygan burial sites II and III). Materials from the sites show close ties with the cultures of the Late Bronze Age in Central Kazakhstan and Western Semirechye as well as of the steppe, the forest-steppe Altai and the Minusinsks Basin. Early Iron Age and Middle Ages sites are poorly explored in the foothills of Eshkiolmes. Individual kurgan burials were excavated at different periods at Talapty I, Kuygan I and II. Typology and Dating. The concentration of Eshkiolmes petroglyphs is one of the largest in Kazakhstan, with a total of 10,000 engravings dated from the Bronze Age to the beginning of the 20th century. Their spatial location follows a certain pattern determined by the functional importance of specific parts of the landscape at different historic periods. Thus, rocks located in the mountainous area of Eshkiolmes, near encampments of the Early Iron Age, medieval and modern nomads, are usually marked with small series' of rough drawings of similar subjects. Bronze Age petroglyphs are very few or nonexistent there. A similar collection of petroglyphs, can be seen along mountain trails that connect parts of the landscape that have economic significance for the

cattle breeders, include encampments, pastures, watering holes, and others. Finally, key accumulations of petroglyphs are concentrated on slopes and watersheds of mountain valleys with abundant rock ledges with broad, smooth and thickly patinated surfaces that served as perfect backgrounds for the drawings. These rocky places, often almost impassable and distant from settlements, have always attracted creators of rock engravings by their picturesque beauty. During the third millennium, hundreds / thousands of engravings were created there, some most impressive and genuine masterpieces. Eshkiolmes petroglyphs were pecked or carved, engraved on rock, but most images were made using a combination of techniques. This specificity of the site is mainly due to the properties of the local rock. Fine-grained sandstone with a glassy smooth surface covered with bluish-black patina was an ideal material that permitted the creation of very expressive exquisite images, in antiquity, in the Middle Ages, and in modern times. Mastery of engraving techniques allowed artists to accurately represent details of real items (armor, clothes, horse outfits), whose comparison with actual artifacts permits the accurate dating of the petroglyphs. Bronze Age engravings (14th/13th-9th centuries BC) are the most numerous with several outstanding series of images from different periods that differ in style, technique and repertoire. These differences are not only related to evolutionary changes in rock art, but also to cultural innovations and migrations to Semirechye from other areas of Central Asia. The findings from settlements and burial sites investigated in the foothills of Eshkiolmes and the Koksu Valley include specimens of ceramics and metal articles (women's adornments, an arrowhead) of the Yelovo Culture dated to the Late Bronze Age in Southern Siberia. In their turn, some series of Rock Art in Central Asia 22 petroglyphs at Eshkiolmes have expressive analogies with rock art sites in the Mountaineous Altai and Western Mongolia. A characteristic of the Bronze Age petroglyphs in Eshkiolmes is the notable prevalence of battle motifs and cattle-stealing scenes, which reflects troubled times filled with tribal warfare and fights for the best pastures. Multiple images of battle chariots and warriors armed with spears, bows and quivers filled with arrows, clubs, or missile rocks on a strap are abundant. However, the petroglyphs of the period also include composite creatures and motifs, apparently of mythical content: «sun-headed» anthropomorphs surrounded by animals or driving chariots; archers shooting a «giant» and others. At least two series of Bronze Age petroglyphs are of particular interest. Their creation is related to a massive re-carving of images from a previous period, when older images were crudely remade, with new details that changed the initial appearance and content of entire compositions. Early Iron Age engravings are notable for their thematic and artistic originality; most are real masterpieces. Unlike petroglyphs made by Bronze Age farmers and pastoralists, the rock art of 1st century BC early nomads is dominated by images of wild fauna represented in a special graphic «animalistic style». At the same time, horse-riding appears and becomes established in the rock art. The heroic theme of nomadic rock art is more fully embodied in petroglyphs of the Medieval Period, which include notable images of the Ancient Turkic Period (6th-8th centuries) and of later periods of the 9th-12th centuries. Rock art compositions include images of battles with archers on foot and riders, as well as motifs from nomadic life including a collective hunt that played a special role in a militarized nomadic society of the 1st millennium

AD. The style of Eshkiolmes medieval engravings is notable for its realism and expression, distinguishing it from other Semirechye sites with rock art of the same period. Historical and contemporary petroglyphs are relatively minor in numbers. Among them, images and Oirat prayer inscriptions of the 17th-18th centuries and Kazakh traditional drawings and epigraphy dated to the 19th – beginning of the 20th century are of special interest. Their repertoire includes riders, livestock and wild animals, whilst hunting scenes, sometimes depicting bows and arrows along with firearms; and yurts and lineage signs are rare. The final stage is that of the Soviet period. Petroglyphs and Cyrillic graffiti of this time occur in small numbers only along nomadic trails, and near wintering grounds in the foothills of Eshkiolmes. Tamgalytas (Ili Kapshagay) Location. Tamgalytas is a site of Tibetan-Oirat art and epigraphy of the 17th-18th centuries, located in the Almaty Region, 25 km north-west of Kapshagay City, on the right bank of the Ili River. In the middle part of Ili Kapshagay (canyon), at the foot of the erosion rock ledge about 500 m long and 40-45 m high, an accumulation of boulders has 17 surfaces depicting four Buddha images (Shakyamuni, Bhaisajyaguru, Akshobya and Nageshvararaja), bodhisattvas of Avalokiteshvara and about 30 inscriptions executed in Tibetan and Oirat writing. Research Status and Documentation. Tamgalytas rock art was first examined in 1856 by a Kazakh researcher, Valikhanov Ch.Ch., and in 1857 by a renowned Russian traveler, geographer Semyonov P.P. and an artist who accompanied him, Kosharov P.M. They made a series of ink and watercolor sketches of individual inscriptions along with images from Tamgalytas, which reflect the appearance of the site at the moment of its discovery. In the second half of the 19th century, Tamgalytas was repeatedly visited by different scientists and regional ethnographers. The most valuable information about the site is contained in manuscripts by Larionov K.A. and specialist articles by Poyarkov F.V., Pantusov N.N., as well as the famous Russian Mongolian Studies Rock Art Sites in Kazakhstan 23 specialist Pozdneev A.M. who first translated most of the inscriptions and gave an interpretation of the Buddha images. A detailed exploration of Tamgalytas was carried out by Pantusov N.N. in 1897 upon the instruction of the Imperial Archeological Commission. In 2008-2009, an expedition from KazSRI-Nomads (Yerofeeva I.V., Aurbekov B.Zh., Rogozhinskiy A.E.) completed a comprehensive study of Tamgalytas and made a recording of inscriptions and images (Yerofeeva 2010, Rogozhinskiy 2010). Present-day interpretation of Tibetan and Oirat epigraphy was done by Yakhontova N.S. (Institute of Oriental Studies, RAS, St. Petersburg) and the iconographic analysis of images done by Yelikhina Yu.I. (State Hermitage, St. Petersburg). Since 1981, Tamgalytas, as a site of sacred Tibetan art of the 17th-18th centuries, has been under the protection of the government. Since 2008, the area of the site has been improved for tourist visits in addition to carrying out conservation activities, but the protection zone of the site has not yet been established. Typology and Dating. The site contains temporally different images and inscriptions created in four stages. The first stage includes images of Buddha Shakyamuni, bodhisattvas of Avalokiteshvara, Bhaisajyaguru Buddha and accompanying Tibetan inscriptions on the central panel, an epigraphic figure of Buddha Nageshvararaja as well as various prayer texts including two mantras of Buddha Manjushri, an address to the Fourth Panchen Lama, Lobsang

Chökyi Gyaltsen (1570 – 1662), and four six-syllable mantras «om ma ni pad me hum» carved on different rocks in a circumference. The second stage includes ten texts of the six-syllable mantra similar in technique, paleography, and content and executed in Oirat «clear script». Simultaneously or a bit earlier, the pictorial series in the sanctuary was supplemented with an image of Buddha Akshobyi, later surrounded by a new cycle of Tibetan epigraphy. In the third stage, a mantra dedicated to Akshobyi appeared later around his image on different faces of nearby boulders – a series of Tibetan inscriptions – including a triple six-syllable mantra, a mantra of Buddha Shakyamuni and even two mantras of Manjushri at the southern edge of the sacred site. The fourth stage included the creation of the longest text in Tamgalytas, reproduced in 11 lines in cursive «clear script». In the recent translation of Yakhontova N.S. it offers gratitude to the Buddha images depicted and to bodhisattva for «overcoming dangers [beginning] from diseases to starvation» and wishes to find «long and endless serenity in this land.» The history of the Tamgalytas complex pertains to the epoch of military and political might and cultural prime of the Dzhungarian Khanate (1635-1757), accompanied by intensive dissemination of Lamaistic Buddhism among the Western Mongolian tribes of Oirats. The creation of the sanctuary is related to the religious and political activities of Galdan Boshugtu Khan (1644–1697): in his day, Lamaism was established among the Oirats. The location for a Buddhist sanctuary was chosen because it is near one of the main river crossings of the Ili River, which played an important role in the network of trans-regional communications in Semirechye at the end of the 17th century – first half of the 18th century as well as in implementing a policy of conquest by the Dzhungarian Khanate in Southern Kazakhstan and Central Asia. Rock Art in Central Asia 24 The sanctuary no longer actively worked or was visited by Lamaists from about 1758, after the defeat of the Dzhungarian Khanate by the troops of China under the Tsin Dynasty and the consequent return of Kazakh and Kyrgyz clans to the lands of Semirechye. A final stage of cultic epigraphy at the Tamgalytas sanctuary pertains to a climactic episode of the last great migration of Volga's Kalmyk-Torguts led by Ubashi Khan in 1771 from Russia to the lands of the former Dzhungarian Khanate. Thus, the Lamaist sanctuary in Tamgalytas Gorge functioned for about 100 years – from 1676/1677 to 1771. The complex of rock engravings and inscriptions in Tamgalytas has no analogies in the western part of Central Asia, neither by the composition of personages of the Tibetan pantheon presented, nor by the number of texts – different in content and languages. There are more than 20 known sites of Tibetan Buddhism dated to the 17th – middle of the 18th century in Kazakhstan, with isolated sacred art sites among them. Cultic sites with the similar replicated prayer formula «om ma ni pad me hum» (Taygak, Akkaynar, Kegen Arasan and others) prevail among several dozens of registered locations of Tibetan and Oirat epigraphy. Tamgalytas images and early inscriptions show some similarity with a group of sites of Tibetan Buddhism in Northern Kyrgyzstan (Yssyg-Ata and Tamga). However, Tamgalytas stands out due to its artistic originality, diversity of epigraphic texts and time span of their creation, which unquestionably reflects its special significance at the time of its creation and functioning. Akterek Location. The Akterek Valley is in the Zhambyl District of the Almaty Region, 4km south of Akterek Village, 100 km west of Almaty City.

Akterek Gorge is located on the northern slope of Zailiyskiy Alatau, the western lower part of the range. Along with other adjacent valleys Kastek – Rgayty – Akterek Gorge forms an important part of traditional mountain transit routes that connect Semirechye and the Ili Valley with the upper reaches of the Chu River, the Issyk Kul Basin and the area of Central Tien Shan. Research Status and Documentation. Archeological research was conducted at various times by the Semirechye Expedition of the AS of KazSSR in the foothill plain near the entrance of Akterek Gorge. In 1956, Ageeva E.-I. excavated two funerary fences and seven kurgans dated to the 3rd-1st centuries BC (Ageeva 1961: 26-28, 35, 37. Fig. 5); Patzevich G.I. explored a small fortified settlement from the 10th-12th centuries AD (AKK. 1960, No. 4032: 289). Further research was renewed under the leadership of Akishev in the late 1980's-early 1990's. Trifonov Yu.-I. discovered and partially excavated burial sites of medieval nomads, but never published his results. Mirzabaev A.-S. researched petroglyphs in Akterek Gorge for the first time (1990: 137-140). In 2007-2009, Rogozhinskiy A.-E. continued exploring and recording the Akterek Valley petroglyphs; a map of the major concentrations of petroglyphs was made and the images photographed. The total number of Akterek petroglyphs exceeds 1,000. Archeological Context. Near the dwelling sites were discovered petroglyphs dated to different periods, dwelling sites (No. 1-5) and an ancient Turkic runic inscription (No. 4). The dwelling sites are dated to the 19th – early 20th centuries, but Early Iron Age and medieval ceramics were found on the surface as well. Typology and Dating. Rock engravings are found practically everywhere on the left-hand rocky slope of the gorge, where the habitation sites are located. They are carved on the well patinated black or dark-brown surfaces of fine-grained sandstone. The most ancient ones date to the Bronze Age. Some are similar to Late Bronze Age petroglyphs in many other locations at Semirechye. An earlier group of engravings is noted for its repertoire and style, and is somewhat similar to some on sites in the southern part of the Chu-Ili Mountains (Akkaynar, Kulzhabasy) and Eastern Fergana Rock Art Sites in Kazakhstan 25 (Saymaly-Tash, Sahaba). Unique compositions include: one with images of three pairs of bulls near a Y-shaped tether and a human in an adoration pose; a solitary human figure with a turned over crescent over the head resembles «moon-headed» personages at Saymaly-Tash. Early Iron Age petroglyphs, the most numerous, are in the tradition of the Saki animal style. As elsewhere at Semirechye, drawings of ancient and medieval nomads often overlap more ancient images. It is common for the latter to complement compositions of preceding epochs with individual images of humans, animals, and tamga signs. A representative series of medieval and Kazakh tamgas next to dwelling sites was discovered at Akterek. The closest analogues to the Akterek tamgas are in the Chu-Ili Mountains and in the Near Issyk Kul Area. Southern Kazakhstan

Geographically, Southern Kazakhstan extends across three administrative regions (Zhambyl, South Kazakhstan and Kyzylorda). Most of the territory is flat and occupied by steppes, semideserts and deserts: in the south-west, on the left bank of the Syrdarya River, by the Kyzyl Kum sands and Shardara steppe; in the east, by the Moyinkum Desert between the valleys of Chu and Talas Rivers; in the north, by the eastern edge of the Dala Desert (Golodnaya Steppe). The middle of the region is

occupied by the Karatau Range (2,176 m); in the south-east, borders are determined by the western spurs of the Talas Alatau (4,027 m), Kyrgyz Alatau (3,820 m); and in the south-west, by the Karzhantau (2,824 m) and Ugam Ranges (4,238 m). The natural and climatic conditions of Southern Kazakhstan are favorable to the development of irrigated agriculture and various forms of cattle-breeding including nomadic. The specificity of that natural environment since antiquity has enabled a long coexistence of settled and nomadic communities. Historically and culturally, this brings together Southern Kazakhstan and Semirechye that both occupy an intermediate position between Central Asia and the steppe-and-forest area of Siberia and the Urals, acting as a contact zone of oases and steppes. Rock art sites are found in all Southern Kazakhstan mountainous regions. Rock paintings have not been discovered. The most numerous and well-researched petroglyphs are at Karatau; the least researched are in the Western Tien Shan highlands, home to the most notable highland complex of petroglyphs: Aksuzhabagly in Talas Alatua. So far, nearly 50 petroglyph sites have been discovered and researched to a different extent in Southern Kazakhstan, but only the Aksuzhabagly petroglyphs receive protection due to their location within a wild life preserve. First reports about petroglyphs in the Karatau Mountains date to the early 20th century, but systematic research of the site commenced in the late 1950's and related to activities of the Southern Kazakhstan Comprehensive Expedition of the Academy of Sciences (Senigova 1962: 87 – 97). The discovery of most known locations in Southern Kazakhstan in the early 1970's was due to the research and exploration of the Northern Karatau Party of the Archeological Expedition led by Kadyrbaev M.K. and Maryashev A.N. (Kadyrbaev & Maryashev 1977: 8-10). Petroglyphs within the two largest locations (Arpauzen and Koybagar) in 1970-1973 became a test site for the development of the then progressive methods of documentation and research of rock engravings. In the 1980's, several locations of petroglyphs in the southern part of Karatau were discovered and explored by Samashev Z. (Teris, Zhyngylshek). Research of Southern Kazakhstan sites intensified at the beginning of this century: a large location of petroglyphs (Sauiskandyk) was discovered in Northern Karatau (Samashev Z. & Shvetz I.N.); a series of sites in Central Karatau was explored (Maryashev A.N. & Potapov S.A.); documentation and research of petroglyphs at Arpauzen and Koybagar, as well as at Tamgalytas in Betpakdala continued (Rogozhinskiy A.E.), in line with site conservation objectives and preparation for a UNESCO serial nomination. Rock Art in Central Asia 26 Many Southern Kazakhstan sites include petroglyph complexes dated to different periods, the most ancient to the Bronze Age. Late Bronze Age (last third of the 2nd millennium BC) engravings are identified from specifics of style, repertoire, and images of items from real life (chariots, armor); this pictorial tradition is also represented on sites at Semirechye, in the Near Issyk Kul Area, the Talas Valley, and Western Tien Shan. Petroglyphs dated to the first half of the 2nd millennium BC are the most diverse, with two key pictorial traditions: petroglyphs related to the Seymin-Turbin artistic tradition of the steppe area in Kazakhstan (Saryarka); petroglyphs whose repertoire and style clearly reflect the influence of the culture and art of pre-historic Central Asia. Analogies exist with Zeravshan Valley sites (Sarmishsay, Soyi-Sobog), Kyzyl Kum (Bukantau) and the southern part of the Chu-Ili Mountains at Semirechye

(Kulzhabasy). Pictorial traditions dated to the Early Iron Age are clearly notable at the Karatau and Talas Range sites in relation to: first, to the tradition of images on «deer stones» in Western Mongolia, Tuva, and Altai; second, to the Early Saki art of nomads in Syrdarya and Pamir. Medieval engravings are also numerous and common wherever petroglyphs are found. Places where natural cliffs or stelae predominantly or exclusively have tamgas and epigraphy (Tamgalytas) constitute a special category in Southern Kazakhstan. Another specificity of Southern Kazakhstan is the abundance of modern petroglyphs (17th – early 20th centuries) and a preserved tradition of creating rock art in the present. The Most Important Sites in Southern Kazakhstan Arpauzen Location. Arpauzen archeological complex is located in the Sozak District of the Southern Kazakhstan Region, 30 km north-west of the district capital – Sholakkorgan Station, 3 km south-west of Abay Village. Geographically, Arpauzen Gorge lies in the foothills of the slope of the Great Range of Near Sydarya Karatau. The Arpauzen Complex is located where the rivers Arpauzen, Taskura and Sarymsakty from the Greater Karatau Range join the Chu River Valley. The highest peaks of the Greater Karatau are there (Bessaz Peak, 2,176m and Kelenshetau Peak, 1,796.5 m). Petroglyphs were made on the slopes at the riverside, on reddish-brown and grayish-brown fine-grained sandstones outcrops. They are rarely found on the northern slopes of erosion valleys. Research Status and Documentation. In 1959, Alpysbaev H.-A. explored a kurgan burial site in the Taskura Valley; this is the first evidence of archeological sites in the Arpauzen Complex (АКК 1960. С.238, № 3428, 3429 (AKK. 1960: 238, No. 3428, 3429). Arpauzen petroglyphs were discovered in 1970 by Maryashev A.N. and were then researched jointly by Kadyrbaev M.K. (Kadyraev & Maryashev 1977). They identified 8 groups of petroglyphs, recorded 3,401 images, and developed a first periodization of the images. The most ancient petroglyphs in Arpauzen were dated by them to the Late Bronze Age. Now, it seems possible to date early Arpauzen petroglyphs to the first half of the 2nd millennium BC. In 2003-2004, archeological research at Arpauzen was resumed by Rogozhinskiy A.E. (KazIRP MMC), within the UNESCO CARAD project and in line with the instructions from the Ministry of Culture of the RK. In 2004, a description of the Arpauzen Complex was prepared to file the site for state protection, a baseline documentation was created (archeological map, inventory of sites, indexed panoramas), 17 groups of petroglyphs with 930 surfaces with images were identified, and reconnaissance excavations were done in two settlements. The total of petroglyphs registered amounts to more than 5,000. In 2002, the Arpauzen petroglyphs were put on the Tentative World Heritage List of UNESCO. Rock Art Sites in Kazakhstan 27 Archeological Context. Arpauzen consists of one complex of archeological sites concentrated in a relatively small area of 37.5 km^2 , dated from the Bronze Age to the early 20th century. A total of 130 archeological sites including 20 settlements and over 80 burial grounds with 17 main concentrations were found. Concentrations of, as well as solitary, Neolithic artifacts were discovered in the piedmont area near springs. The most ancient researched sites include the Bronze Age settlements of Arpauzen IV and VI. The ceramics are heterogeneous and include fragments of dishware made with a potter's wheel, of Tautarin type and similar to materials from the Tazabayan settlements in the lower reaches of the Zarafshan River (Gudzhayli) dated to the middle of the 2nd

millennium BC. There are also Kurgan burial sites from the Early Iron Age, medieval ritual fences with statues, remnants of wintering grounds and fortified villages with traces of irrigation channels and cemeteries of the 17th-18th centuries. Key concentrations of petroglyphs at Arpauzen are located on slopes between two adjacent erosion valleys. In the vicinity of the villages, there is a concentration of petroglyphs with frequent overlapping. Typology and Dating. A vast majority of petroglyphs are pecked. Engraved images are sporadic. Possibly, the earliest drawings include a small composition with images of bulls incised and differing in style and technique from Bronze Age petroglyphs. All periods are dominated by images of Bactrian camels, also found at other Karatau sites. Three series of engravings stand out at Arpauzen. Cases of mutual superimposition of these petroglyphs are very rare, so their chrono-cultural attributions are based on comparisons of style and iconography with other sites. The earliest petroglyphs, the most obvious, are concentrated on rocks in groups 8, 9 and 10 near the settlements of Arpauzen IV, VI; small series are found in groups 3 and 5. Their varied repertoire includes images of horse, deer, wild ram, goat, dog, longlegged birds (cranes?) and humans (bird and Asiatic wild ass hunters, warriors with axes, bows and sticks); there are also four-wheeled carts pulled by horses or camels, mirrors, «labyrinths» and signs. Images of both animals and humans are exquisitely rendered, indicating the volume of three-dimensional models on a two-dimensional surface. About 100 of these engravings are in groups 5, 7, 9-11; some of them are unquestionable masterpieces. Real-life objects depicted (mirrors, «batons») have prototypes among cultural artifacts found at Sapalli (Uzbekistan), dated to the first half of the 2nd millennium BC. Animal images are also close to toreutic items and figure-casting of pre-historic Bactria and Margiana (Gonur-tepe, ZardchaKhalifa). These Arpauzen petroglyphs are similar in repertoire, style, and iconography to Bronze Age petroglyphs at Sarmyshsay (Uzbekistan), also characterized by the interaction of steppe tribes and farmers of Central Asia (Avanesova 2002: 17). To another Bronze Age type belong petroglyphs concentrated in groups 12 and 13 around the Arpauzen IV settlement and sometimes found in groups 11, 14, 16. They are chronologically close to those of type I, but significantly differ from them in repertoire, style and iconography. They include humans and animals (camels, horses and bulls), carved in a style close to that of petroglyphs at Baykonur (Novozheniv 2002, Table 26, 1a, Tables 31, 14. 4-5) and Terekty-Aulie in the western part of Sary-Arka (Samashev et al. 2000: 7, fig. 1,7). They reflect the process of Andronovo Culture tribes moving from Central Kazakhstan southwards to oases of Central Asia in the middle of the 2nd millennium BC. A series of images at Arpauzen are similar in repertoire and style to Semirechye petroglyphs dated to the Late Bronze Age. They occur in early palimpsests at Arpauzen and overlie petroglyphs of the Rock Art in Central Asia 28 two earlier types. Their repertoire also includes images of horse-drawn chariots, coupled humans in an adoration pose, and a bull figure among the animals. There are few petroglyphs of the Early Iron Age at Arpauzen, but several compositions with large (up to 1m) images of deer, wild boar, and bear in the Saki animal style are remarkable due to their high quality of execution. Some of them reproduce in detail animal images known from items of Saki applied art in the Near Aral Area and Pamir from the 7th-6th centuries BC. The medieval period at Arpauzen is

represented by images of camels and riders that often supplement ancient compositions. The repertoire lacks battle scenes and only a very few images represent riding standard – bearers, typical for rock art of the ancient Turkic epoch in other territories. Along with images of Bactrian camels, one-humped camels begin to be depicted during this period. A specific feature of Arpauzen petroglyphs is the abundance of Kazakh images dated to the 18th-20th centuries. The prevailing themes are riders prowess, hunting, pastures or cattle stealing; the weapons only include firearms, with matchlock guns on bipods. Kazakh petroglyphs and inscriptions of the 19th-20th centuries, carved in Arabic, Latin, and Cyrillic occur everywhere in the main locations, predominating near the main trails and roads. Koybagar Location. Koybagar Gorge is located 30 km north of Arpauzen, 5 km west of Kozmoldak Village. The petroglyph site is at the mouth of a deep gorge, on the left side of the Karakuyis River valley and its wide delta in the foothill uplands. The erosion of the ancient surface resulted in a chain of small hills, on the slopes of which are scatterings of boulders with petroglyphs covered with «desert patina». Research Status and Documentation. As at Arpauzen, the site was, for the first time, explored in 1970-1971 by the Karaut Party of the Southern Kazakhstan Archeological Expedition led by Kadyrbaev M.K. and Maryashev A.N. Those pioneers identified three main concentrations of petroglyphs near the mouth of Karakuiz Gorge – Koybagar I-III. The petroglyphs are pecked on individual boulders located on the slopes of three hills with flat tops (Kadyrbaev & Maryashev 1977). In 2003-2004, the Koybagar petroglyphs were explored by Rogozhinskiy A.E. as part of the UNESCO CARAD Project. The geographic coordinates of the main petroglyph sites were recorded, and photos and copies of more than 130 boulders with images were made. Archeological Context. A small concentration of petroglyphs exists on the southern and southwestern slopes of the hills. Multiple kurgan burial sites of ancient and medieval nomads are well preserved on the flat tops of the hills and along the mouth of the gorge. In small ravines along the Karakuyis River bed, shielded from the winds, are tens of dwelling sites dating to the 18th - early 20th centuries, and, possibly, other later settlements. Typology and Dating. Petroglyphs dated to the Bronze Age and the early 20th century stand out. The most ancient are distinguished by their wide variety, with a bull and «spectacle-shaped» signs (two circles connected with a line). Late Bronze Age ones include many scenes with battle chariots and combat motifs. A chariot driven by two horses is rare in rock art. Bronze Age petroglyphs predominate over Early Iron Age and Medieval ones. The last burst of intensive pictorial activity in Koybagar dates to Late Middle Ages and modernity or the 17th – early 20th century. Sauiskandyksai Location. Sauiskandyksai is on the north-eastern slopes of Karatau in the Shielin District of the Kyzylorda Region, 60 km east of Shieli, 15km north of Aksumbe Village. Rock Art Sites in Kazakhstan 29 Research Status and Documentation. Rock art images at Sauiskandyk were discovered in 2004 by an expedition from a Turkish-Kazakh University (Turkestan City) led by Yeleunova M. They were researched and recorded under the leadership of Samashev Z. (Institute of Archeology of SAS of the RK), in partnership with Shvetz I.N. In 2008-2009, Rogozhinskiy A.E. studied both petroglyphs and epigraphy. Sauiskandyk is the northernmost location of petroglyphs in Karatau. Typology and Dating. The Sauiskandyk Valley is about 3 km long; two

Bronze and Middle Ages dwelling sites were identified in the upper reaches of the valley. The main concentrations of petroglyphs are located on the right bank of the valley and along the riverbeds on shale and sandstone outcrops, with a total of more than 3000 images. Bronze Age petroglyphs show artistic expressivity and a diverse repertoire. Two series of drawings stand out. The first one includes images of animals (bulls, horses, and predators) and humans (warriors with clubs, women, erotic scenes, composite creatures) that significantly differ stylistically from other known Karatau Bronze Age petroglyphs. Images from this group prevail in the middle and lower parts of the valley. The second group includes engravings concentrated in the upper part of the valley near dwelling sites. Images of horses with a pronounced mane are dominant; there are many scenes with camels, humans and signs in the shape of a right-angled cross. Stylistically, these petroglyphs are comparable to the second Arpauzen type and to many others in Central Kazakhstan and date to the middle of the 2nd millennium BC. Late Bronze Age petroglyphs are small in number, with bulls, horses, and chariots. Early Iron Age drawings, with expressive scenes with naturalistic animals and compositions with humans, are not numerous. There are very few medieval petroglyphs, but they also include quite expressive compositions: covered wheeled wagons on wheels with spokes surrounded with riders, camels; a yurt with female and male figures inside; a scene of battle between two riders; tamgas. A large series of Arabic inscriptions (about 40) and tamgas of different types, dating to the 18th – early 20th centuries, were mainly found on rocks along the trail running through the bottom of the gorge. There are also images of rifles on bipods and Kazakh tamgas dated to the 17th – 18th centuries. A large number of texts of apparently religious and memorial content are related to the functioning of a transit caravan road that passed through Sauiskandyk Gorge in the northern part of Karatau. Tamgalytas near Lake Tamgalynura Location. The site is in the Sozak District of the Southern Kazakhstan Region in the north-western end of the Betpakdala desert, on the southern bank of salt Lake Tamgalynura, on the left bank of the channel Sarysi-Boktyrkaryn River. Research Status of the Site. The first reports about Tamgalytash and its images and inscriptions date to the late 19th – early 20th century. The map of the Western Siberian military district (1896) indicates a «stone Tamgaly-Tash» on the southern bank of salt Lake Tamgaly-Tuz on a highland (Tamgaly-Dzhar Gorge); a more detailed map of the same site (1920) (P. XIV. Л. 8) indicates stone Tamgaly-Tash on the left slope of an erosion valley where Tamgaly Spring is shown at the mouth of the valley. When information was collected for military topographic maps, ethnographic information about images on the rock and their meaning for the evaluation of the Kazakhs along the Sarysu River was also collected. Rock Art in Central Asia 30 In 1895, an interpreter (Khasan Bekhodzhin) who accompanied a military doctor from Akmolinsk City, Kuznetsov A.I., photographed and sketched signs on the Tamgalytas boulder and translated some inscriptions (Kuznetsov 1927: 123)). In 1936, the geologist Satpaev K.I. explored Tamgalytas (1941: 69). In 1946, Margulan A.H. explored the site and distorted the interpretation of an inscription translated by Bekhodzhin Kh. in order to draw a false historical conclusion about the origin of the site as if it related to the unification of Kazakh tribes and the proclamation of the Kazakh Khanate in the 15th century (Margulan & Ageeva 1948:

131; Margulan 1997: 36-37; Margulan 2003, Fig. 361). His statement that «there are names of Ak-Orda khans Urus-Khan, Kuyichirk Barak and many others among the inscriptions» is also unreliable (Margulan 1997: 36-37). In 2009, an expedition from KazSRI-Nomads (Rogozhinskiy A.E.) made an inventory of the petroglyphs and photographed all the known surfaces; one more petroglyph site was identified near the Tamalytas boulder. Archeological Context. A Kazakh necropolis consisting of 20 burial structures of different types and different state of preservation is found on the terrace near the Tamgalytas boulder. There is a stone slab with an epitaph (a symbol of faith) and a tamga represented as two parallel lines on one of the mounds. The inscription dates to the late 19th century. Neolithic stone artifacts were found on several sites along the shoreline terrace of the lake. Typology and Dating. The site is located on the southern shore of Lake Tamgalynur, in Tamgalydzhar Gorge. The shoreline terrace is cut across by many erosion valleys, with Tamgaly Spring located in one of them; several isolated outcrops of sandstone are above the spring along 200 km on the left side of a small ravine. The loose substrate lends itself to handling and destruction; the rock surfaces are coarse, reddish-brown, covered with dark-brown and black patina («desert patina») in some places. The largest number of ancient signs and inscriptions were found on a sandstone outcrop, a remnant of «Tamgalytas stone», closest to the spring. Higher along the dry riverbed, there are three more large sandstone outcrops with a large number of inscriptions and signs. Three temporally different groups of petroglyphs can be made out: ancient tamgas without accompanying epigraphy; Arabic inscriptions, sometimes accompanied by tamgas; Cyrillic inscriptions-graffiti of the 20th century. The earliest tamgas are deeply (up to 0.5-2.0 cm) abraded and hammered into surfaces and fragments of Tamgalytas 1 and 3. A sign consisting of two or three parallel lines frequently occurs; others are sporadic. Matching these tamgas with those of Oguz and Kipchak people suggests a date of origin for the first Tamgalytas images within the 8th-12th centuries. The second period at the site is that of the early Tamgalytas epigraphy; Beysenbiev T.K. who studied several inscriptions dates them to the end of the 19th century. Some tamgas of different Kazakh tribes from the Minor and Middle Zhuses are dated to the same period. The final stage of the site's history, judging by the dates of visitor's inscriptions, covers a period of time from the 1930's to the 1990's. There is another small group of boulders with tamgas located 1.2 km to the south-east of Tamgalytas on the right slope of the erosion valley. One slab was used to build the Tamgalytas site erected recently at the edge of the terrace. A total of 10 varieties of these signs are comparable to tamgas of the medieval period identified within the main location of Tamgalytas. Rock Art Sites in Kazakhstan 31 Central Kazakhstan Sites The middle part of Kazakhstan is occupied by a vast mountainous and steppe country – Saryarka (Kazakh Uplands). The unique landscape of Saryarka houses material evidence of the region's ancient history left by ancient Stone Age hunters and Neolithic people, by shepherds and metal makers and by nomadic tribes from the Early Iron Age, Middle Ages, and modernity. The evidence includes rock drawings, although such sites are less numerous on the map of the central part of Kazakhstan. The area of the main watershed Saryarka is mostly represented by mountain rocks not very suitable for engraving. Those preserved are on isolated rocks at a great distance from one another, mainly on relatively smooth

granites and diorites enclosed by natural ledges. Dravert P.L. Grotto in the Bayanaul Mountains is a famous rock art site, discovered in 1926 on the south-eastern shore of Zhasybay Lake by a Russian geologist and poet, after whom it was named. Several humans facing the entrance of the cave were painted in ochre on its roof, so they could be seen from the depths of the niche. Paintings similar in contents and technique were also discovered later in other shelters in forested areas of the lake. The main motifs on the walls and roofs include humans, but also isolated animals, birds, a bow with an arrow and unsophisticated geometric shapes or signs. It is difficult to date them; it is unlikely that most would date beyond the Bronze Age, a period of active peopling of the area with Andronovo and Begazy-Dandybaev culture tribes. Rock paintings in central Saryarka were also made in another remarkable site – Tesiktas Grotto – located in the spurs of the Kyzyltau Mountains, in the upper reaches of one of the Sherubay-Nura River tributaries, far from Lake Bayanaul. Although the natural environment is quite similar, Tesiktas represents a different type of landscape and rock paintings. Petroglyphs in Akbidayik and Olenty in the north-eastern periphery of Saryarka – a rare type of archeological site for the area– are among the northernmost rock art sites in Kazakhstan. They represent the earliest examples of steppe-tribes' rock art from the 3rd to the first half of the 2nd millennium BC, which permits us to trace some pictorial traditions of the Bronze Age common in the southern regions of Saryarka (Northern Near Balkhash Area, Ylitau) and farther in the Karatau and Chu-Ili Mountains. Terekty Aulie, 90km east of Zhezkazgan City and 20 km north-west of Terekty Station in the Karagandy Region, is a remarkable rock art site in the south-west of Saryarka. It is small, both in terms of the space occupied and its number of petroglyphs on granite. The main series of Bronze Age petroglyphs is homogeneous and special. Many archeological sites belong to different periods, with Paleolithic, Neolithic and Bronze Age dwelling sites, Early Iron Age kurgans, remains of mining activities, a necropolis with medieval and 18th – 19th mausoleums. Terekty Aulie is one of the few rock art sites in Kazakhstan where rocks with ancient petroglyphs are part of a cycle of religious and cultic worship. The most ancient petroglyphs favor horse images. There are also two-humped Bactrian camels, bulls, goats, deer, snakes, a feline predator and a chariot. The integrity of the iconography and style of this Terekty Aulie rock art, attributed to the Seymin-Turbin pictorial traditions from parallels with items of those cultures, serves to identify rock art sites in the southwest of Saryarka (Baykonur Valley), south Kazakhstan (Karatau) and Central Asia (Fergana). A vast mountainous semi-desert exists from the Northern Near Balkhash area to the south of the main watershed of Sary-Arka (Kazakh Uplands). The harsh weather of this practically impassable region has preserved some remarkable ancient sites including petroglyphs. Some were discovered in the 1960's by Margulan A.H., geologists Medoev A.G. and Aubekerov B.Zh. and studied in 2007 by Rogozhinskiy A.E., but, in general, this area of Kazakhstan is considered as poorly Rock Art in Central Asia 32 researched. Two famous sites – Besoba and Kalmakemel – are good examples of the rock art in the Northern Near Balkhash Area. The Most Important Sites of Central Kazakhstan Tesiktas Grotto Location. Tesiktas Grotto is located in the Shet District of the Karaganda Region, 13km north-east of the district capital (Aksu-Ayuly), 5 km north-west of Aktobe Village, in the

foothills of the Kyzyltau Mountains. Research Status and Documentation. The Tesiktas Grotto paintings were examined in the 1940's by Magulan A.H.; in the 1980's, the paintings were recorded by Novozhenov V.A. (Novozhenov 2002). In 2007, the site was studied by Rogozhinskiy A.-E. Archeological Context. A kurgan burial site, west of the rock with paintings on the adjacent plain, is dated to the Early Iron Age. Ten kilometers east of the paintings, there is a vertical stelae-shaped rock. Typology and Dating. Two isolated towering granite rocks in the piedmont plain are at some distance from the low hills. The upper part of one of the rocks has a large open niche with paintings on its high arch. At the centre of the arch, one can see two short-horned oxen and several crosslike signs; nearby are amorphous spots of red ochre – traces of other unpreserved images, which could only be sketched in the 20th century. One of the animals was outlined, only part of the second remains. On the second surface of the arch, there is one more noticeable contour figure, possibly an animal depicted less realistically. Beyond the open niche, on the side rocky surfaces, traces of other paintings are nearly completely obliterated and indiscernible. An opening forms a wide passage in the rock oriented south to north, while the legs of preserved animal images point to the east and their heads face south. Possibly, the orientation of the drawings in relation to cardinal points was less significant, since during the days of low solstice, one can observe rays passing through the opening in the rock lighting the paintings and creating an impressive view. The age of the Tesiktas paintings has not been determined but researchers attribute them to the Bronze Age (Margulan 2007: 20; Novozhenov 2002). Akbidayik Location. Akbidayik Gorge is in the Ekiastuz District of the Pavlodar Region, 1.5-2 km south-east of Maykain Station. The drawings were executed on the smooth reddish surface of a large (15× 25 m) sandstone outcropping 0.5-0.7 m above its surroundings. The central part of the rock with petroglyphs was severely damaged by the extraction of building stones; its western part, with several spectacular compositions, is well preserved. Research Status and Documentation. Akbidayik rock art was discovered in 1990 by Mertz V.K. (Pavlodar Archeological Expedition). In 2004, the exploration of the site and a baseline documentation were carried out in partnership with Rogozhinskiy A.E. to file for state protection: an archeological map of the complex, an inventory list, indexed panorama, photos and copies from engraved surfaces were made; Iskakov K.T. (assistant of conservation specialist) studied the state of preservation of the petroglyphs and recorded damages. Archeological Context. More than 30 archeological sites were identified in the vicinity of the petroglyphs including dwelling-sites/workshops from the Stone Age (Lower Paleolithic, Neolithic Rock Art Sites in Kazakhstan 33 and Eneolithic /Chalcolithic), settlements and burial sites (Bronze Age – Early Iron Age), petroglyphs as well as remnants of a railway embankment dated to the early 20th century. Typology and Dating. At Akbidayik, there are engravings from three/four stages of cultures in the north-eastern periphery of Saryarka: Neolithic, Eneolithic, Bronze and Early Iron Ages. It is not improbable that some drawings may date to later periods. Nearly 100 petroglyphs in several groups were discovered on horizontal and inclined rock surfaces. The most expressive drawings are concentrated on the north-western surface; there are cases of superimpositions. The most ancient petroglyphs include schematic humans with widely spread arms, legs

and a pronounced phallus. Next to them are barely-discernible zoomorphic images. Some drawings are damaged due to wind erosion of the rock surface. Petroglyphs were apparently pecked with a rough stone tool. An archer is overlaid by a horse. These drawings may date to the Stone Age. The most numerous group includes large animals realistically depicted, with a multi-figured panel including over 30 different images with large (30-75 cm) figures of horses, Asiatic wild asses, oxen, goats, schematic humans and unidentified signs. On the right is another group of drawings with deer and horses. Naturalistic horses are prominent in most compositions. The same technique was used to peck their silhouette regularly. Despite the fact that many figures overlap, most were apparently created within one period in a specific order. Akbidayik horses have analogies in the eastern and south-eastern regions of Kazakhstan as well as in the Turbin-Seymin pictorial tradition at the start of the Early and Advanced Bronze Age. In addition to these two groups of the most ancient petroglyphs at Akbidayik, there are images of bulls (Bos primigenius) with horns lowered and pointing forward, overlapping mountain goats, saiga antelopes, deer and other animals. These images date from the Eneolithic to the Early Bronze Age (3rd – early 2nd millennium BC) and to the Early Iron Age (7th-4th centuries BC). Olenti Location. The petroglyphs are on the right bank of the Olenti River, 10km south-west of Tay Village in the Ekibastuz District of the Pavlodar Region. More than 50 petroglyphs were found on 17 surfaces of large blocks of light-brown sandstone rocks on the slopes of the river terrace. Research Status and Documentation. The Olenti petroglyphs were discovered in the early 1970's by a regional ethnographer Mool O. In the 1990's, the site was explored by Mertz V.K.; in 2005, the petroglyphs were examined by Samashev Z. Archeological Context. A systematic research of the district revealed a great number of temporally different archeological sites: Neolithic and Eneolithic dwelling sites, Bronze Age burials and kurgans of the Early Iron Age nomads. Typology and Dating. All the engraved rocks are on the steep slope of a terrace; their surfaces are encrusted with a thick layer of lichen. Individual drawings are pecked, but in the soft rock, most engravings were created by using a technique of deep carving, some even appearing as basreliefs. Petroglyphs form small compositions consisting of several animal and human figures. Often, the drawings are grouped around one or two images centrally positioned: a human is in the center of one of the rocks with a panther, oxen, and other poorly discernible images. There are erotic scenes. Animals include oxen with long horns curved upwards, horses with a fringe on their heads, deer, saiga antelope, and others. Rock Art in Central Asia 34 According to their stylistic specifics and iconography, two major pictorial traditions were identified at Olenti. The first includes a series of humans (erotic couples, a birthing woman, archers) and oxen with horns either long or curving upwards, while the second one includes horses carved in a manner indicative of the Bronze Age Turbin-Seymin pictorial tradition. Early images at Olenti have no accurate analogies among known Kazakhstan rock art sites; their repertoire, technique, style, and iconography are akin to images on bas-reliefs in the Apsheron Peninsula. These early Olenti petroglyphs are supposedly dated to the Eneolithic – Early Bronze Age, and thus related to the earliest images of rock art in Northern Saryarka. Besoba Location. The Besoba Valley petroglyphs are located in the Karaganda Region, 45km north-east of Sayak City, on the right bank

of the Turanga River, along the eastern slope of the Semizbugu Mountains. Research Status and Documentation. Sites in the Semizbugu Mountains and Besoba Valley were discovered and researched in the 1960's by geologists Medoev A.G. and Aubekerov B.Zh. An archeological and geomorphological map of the area was then made (Medoev 1979). In 2007, Rogozhinskiy A.E. studied, recorded and photographed petroglyphs at Besoba, and drew up an archeological map. Archeological Context. The Besoba plain stretches along the eastern slopes of the Semizbugu Mountains. A large complex of dwelling-sites/workshops dated to the Paleolithic and Neolithic, kurgan burial sites from the Early Iron Age, wintering grounds and cemeteries dated to the 19thearly 20th centuries were discovered. The topography of the sites points to an erratic frequentation of the region at certain historical periods. The most favorable conditions for life existed, apparently, in the Neolithic and Bronze Age. Typology and Dating. Petroglyphs are pecked on diorite porphyries 2-3 m above their surroundings. The rocks stretch from north to south in several rows along the valley for 5-10 km and form natural galleries with ancient drawings. A total of about 300 surfaces with rock art were recorded with nearly 1,000 petroglyphs. In some places, vertical and inclined surfaces of rocks stretch for tens of meters. There are many images on rocks closer to the river. Neolithic artifacts were also found. Petroglyphs are rarely found on sites far from the water. No sites from the 2nd millennium BC were identified, but more than half the Besoba petroglyhs date to the Bronze Age. Images include numerous horses, scenes with humans and a two-wheeled cart. The Early Saki petroglyphs, which are rare, are hammered on good horizontal surfaces. They often include contour figures of deer and panthers as well as horses hooves, many re-carved in later periods. Drawings of the Saki Period are nonexistent, thus suggesting a gap in rock art tradition in the second half of the 1st millennium BC. During the medieval period, artists often re-carved and modified ancient petroglyphs, for example Bronze Age horses were refreshed with added details of harness and riders. Lineage tamgas form a special type of petroglyphs. A final period of rock engravings dates to the 19th - early 20th centuries and is attributed to the settlement of Argyn Kazakh tribes in the region. Their tamgas are found near wintering grounds. Rock Art Sites in Kazakhstan 35 Images of horse hoof tracks were replicated many times, and ancient images were also re-carved at that time. Kalmakemel Location. The Kalmakemel Mountains are in the Karaganda Region, 70 km north-west of Sayak City. Research Status and Documentation. In 2007, the Kalmakemel petroglyphs were researched and documented by Rogozhinskiy A.E. who drew up an archeological map and photographed the petroglyphs. Archeological Context. A broad valley, with habitation sites dated to the Neolithic, the Middle Ages, and the 19th-20th centuries, and Early Iron Age kurgan burial sites, intersects with a low mountain massif from east to west. The most ancient sites include two identified dwelling sites/workshops from the Upper Paleolithic. On the left slope of the gorge, petroglyphs are found in especially large quantities in the middle part of the valley, with a total of about 2,000 images, which makes it the most important Northern Near Balkhash Area site. Typology and Dating. Most engravings date to the Bronze Age, with numerous horses, hunting scenes, solar signs and others. Other periods are represented to a lesser degree, but also with expressive images, such as deer in Early Saki style, a

medieval image of a dog in a heraldic pose, and others. The most ancient Kalmakemel petroglyphs are superficially pecked, apparently with a stone tool. Hundreds of images are of horses; other animals were rarely depicted – ox, deer, dogs; images of humans are sporadic. The horses, similar and realistic, are short-legged with a drooping abdomen and a massive head with a small mane. They are followed by mares with foals. Their legs are connected to one line below. Humans are shown controlling the animals by flinging a rope on their necks or hunting and striking them with an arrow. The opposition between humans as masters and animals is emphasized by specific drawing techniques or the skillful use of nuances on the surface. A couple of harnessed horses proves that ancient Kalmakemel petroglyphs depicted a community of early cattle-breeders, where animal hunting and taming went along with the use of domesticated animals. Iconographic and stylistic parallels with artistic bronze objects of the Seymin-Turbin type date the petrogl yphs to the first half of the 2nd century BC. Among Kazakhstan rock art sites, the Akbidayik engravings of northeastern Saryarka are closest in content to the Kalmakemel petroglyphs. In the south-east of the region, analogies include engravings at Terekty Aulie and Baykonur River Valley, distinguish ed by the presence of Bactrian camel images. Late Bronze Age engravings are prominent, even if not very numerous, at Kalmakemel with horse drawn chariots, battle scenes and solar scenes – i.e. the whole range of Kazakhstan themes for that period. The repertoire of petroglyphs from early and medieval nomads is much richer than at Besoba, but their quantity is still small, with isolated silhouettes of a deer, horse hooves and other animals in the style of Western Mongolia and Altai «deer» rocks. A composition with human figures vividly resembles original drawings of the Tagarian culture in the Minusinsk Basin. Medieval petroglyphs are inexpressive, but they include tamgas, also found on other sites from the Altai to Tarbagay to the Chu Valley. Later petroglyphs are concentrated near wintering grounds dating to the late 19th – early 20th centuries, represented with quite realistic engravings; Kazakh tamgas are frequent. Rock Art in Central Asia 36 Sites in Eastern Kazakhstan Eastern Kazakhstan occupies the south-western part of the Altai (Rudniy and Southern Altai Ranges), the Zaysan Basin, the Kalbi Plateau, the Saur and Tarbagatay Ranges, the Near Irtysh Plain and the eastern part of the Kazakh Uplands (Chingiztau). The region is part of the Arctic Ocean and Kara Sea basins and the drainage area of Lake Balkhash. The watershed stretches along the Tarbagatay and Chingiztau Ranges. The main river in Eastern Kazakhstan – the Irtysh – flows for 1,700 km within Kazakhstan. The largest lakes include Zaysan, Markakol, Alakol, and Sassykkol. The Altai and Tarbagatay Mountains are the main places for rock art in Eastern Kazakhstan. The history of rock art research in Kazakhstan began with the discovery of a series of sites in the Near Irtysh Area in the 19th century. Different researchers (Spasskiy G.I., Vlangali A., Adrianov A.V.) then identified dozens of sites in the Altai and Tarbagatay Mountains (Spasskiy 1818; Adrianov 1916)). In the 1930's, Chernikov S.S. continued their research; in 1971-1983, Eastern Kazakhstan rock art was researched and documented by Samashev Z., who systematized and summarized data accumulated by the end of the 20th century about the localization and chronology of petroglyphs. In 2008, certain sites in Tarbagatay and the Altai were explored by Rogozhinskiy A.E. The

mountainous regions of Eastern Kazakhstan harbor a great many rock art sites, which distinguishes the region from others in Kazakhstan. Their chronology remains unclear in most cases, but the substrate, repertoire, and iconography reveal similarities with sites in the upper reaches of the Irtysh, in China. Some traditions of Bronze Age, Early Iron Age, and mediaeval rock art, well-represented in the Altai, the Minusinsk Basin and Tuva, in Russia and Western Mongolia, are identifiable among the petroglyphs on the right bank of the Irtysh and Tarbagatay. Bronze Age petroglyphs in the Seymin-Turbin tradition, commonly found from there westwards – in Central and Southern Kazakhstan – are present in many sites of the region. Late Bronze Age and Early Iron Age petroglyphs in the Near Irtysh Area have few similarities with sites in the Chu-Ili Mountains, but are still found in large groups on Eastern Semirechye sites, in the Dzhungarian Alatau. In general, the geographic location and natural specifics of Eastern Kazakhstan during the Late Holocene turned this region into a nodal place of continental communications and migratory processes that took place across the forest-steppe and arid zones of Central Asia. The Most Important Sites in Eastern Kazakhstan Akbaur Location. A grotto with rock paintings in Akbaur is located 28 km south of Ust Kamenogorsk, 4.5 km north of Besterek Village in the Eastern Kazakhstan Region, on the right bank of the Urankay River, in a small valley. The left side of the valley is occupied by a rocky bald peak (the Akbaur). It is made up of diorite and wind erosion has created bizarre stone figures with overhangs and spacious niches. A grotto with rock paintings is located at the foothill of the southern slope of the Akbaur. Despite its proximity to a main highway, a large regional capital and active visitation of the site by tourists, the grotto paintings and the surrounding landscape are well preserved. Research Status and Documentation. The Akbaur paintings were researched and documented in the 1970's-1980's by Samashev Z. (Samashev 2006)). Transparent paper attached to the rock with plasticine, remnants of which still remain in large spots on the rock surface, were used to copy the paintings. In 1997-1998, the grotto was studied by a group of experts in archeology and astronomy led by Marsadolov L.S. (St. Petersburg). In 2008, the Akbaru Valley and the grotto paintings were studied by Rogozhinskiy A.E. Rock Art Sites in Kazakhstan 37 Archeological Context. Remains of ancient habitation sites with stone tools, ceramics of early nomads and Neolithic flint artifacts were found at the wide mouth of the valley along the northern slope of the Akbaur. Two or three compositions with horses, deer herds and humans are carved in a crust of desert varnish on an isolated rock detached from the massif. On the opposite side of the valley, a small concentration of petroglyphs is also carved on horizontal surfaces of shale covered with a brown patina. Petroglyphs at both sites are similar in style and technique and date to the Late Bronze and Early Iron Ages (late 2nd – 1st millennium BC). Typology and Dating. The grotto, located 5 m above the surface, is easily accessible: inclined layers of rocks that compose the massif provide an ascent in steps. A wide oval cavity under the overhang is about 9 m long and reaches human height only at the entrance. Daylight penetrating through the opening is enough to see the paintings on the roof and internal walls of the shelter. The ground is inclined and rises to the wall so that one can only see all the paintings at once from the entrance; the height of the roof, where paintings are positioned, does not exceed 1m, so it is only possible to closely examine them sitting

or lying-down on the uneven surface. All figures (about 80) are painted in a reddish-brown ochre and are similar to each other, with linear drawing, simple shapes and unified compositions, suggesting their simultaneity. The paintings predominantly fill the even surface of the roof that resembles a large shell containing the most informative paintings: a two-wheeled cart with a pole facing the entrance, a goat, and two or three humans, as well as signs that resemble a primitive tent flanking the remaining paintings. On the foreground, a rhomboid sign is divided into four sectors with a central dot in each next to a human figure; two lines branch out from vertices of this sign. Other paintings depict silhouettes and contour triangular shapes as well as lines connecting some images. The composition borders are framed with cross-like figures. Archeologists use the two-wheeled cart to date the Akbaur grotto paintings to the late 3rd – early 2nd centuries BC. In any case, the Akbaur cart is the most ancient image of a wheeled vehicle in Kazakhstan and Central Asia. Terekty Location. The painted shelter is 50km north-east of Kalzhir Village and 2.5km north of Terekty Village (former Alekseevka) in the Markakol District of the Eastern Kazakhstan Region, on the right bank of the Irtysh, in the south-eastern spurs of the Kurchum Range, in the Terekty River valley. Research Status and Documentation. Rock paintings in the vicinity of Terekty Village were discovered by local residents; only a shelter with paintings in red, yellow and black ochre was known prior to the 1990's; it is now ruined. In the 1980's, these paintings were examined by Samashev Z. and Rogozhinskiy A.E. at different times. In 2008, Aktaylakov E. and Rogozhinskiy A.E. discovered and studied paintings on another site. Typology and Dating. The shelter with paintings is in a small gorge; the paintings were preserved on a vertical surface (2x1.5 m) under a granite dome. Contour figures of two horses, deer, two wild boars, humans and several less distinctive images were painted in red ochre on the rock; all animals are shown moving from right to left. On the right of the composition, two humans differ in size, manner, and color: the smaller is painted red-brown and is apparently later than the other paintings. To the left of the humans are horses and two wild boars. A vertical line painted in the same brown crosses the upper animal's back, like a spear with a pointed end. Traces of later additions to the paintings are present on the left part of the composition: three small brown cross like figures partially overlap the hind legs of the horse. The left side of the panel is severely damaged: the granite surface spalled in some places and many painted figures are preserved only fragmentarily. The painting, apparently, depicts a hunting scene. Rock Art in Central Asia 38 The Terekty paintings show great similarities with paintings in North-Western China shelters, in the upper reaches of the Black Irtysh. It is suggested that the paintings in Eastern Kazakhstan are to be dated within the Neolithic and Bronze Age. Moldazhar Location. The Moldazhar Valley is 100 km south-east of Ayaguz City, 85 km south-west from the district capital (Aksuat Village) in the Tagbagatay District of the Eastern Kazakhstan Region, in the south-western spurs of the Tarbagatay Range in the Kyzyltas Mountains. Research Status and Documentation. The Moldazhar petroglyphs were discovered by an artist regional ethnographer, Sadykov S., and studied by Rogozhinskiy A.E. in 2008. A large complex of habitation sites, burials and petroglyphs dated to the Neolithic, Bronze Age, Early Iron Age, Middle Ages and to the 19th – early 20th century are in two adjacent valleys (Moldazhar and Tekebay). An archeological map of the district

was drawn up, the petroglyphs in the main concentration were recorded, and copies of several surfaces were made. Archeological Context. Neolithic and Bronze Age habitation sites are located in the upper reaches of the valleys. Stone fences with Bronze Age burials and Early Iron Age kurgans constitute small groups in high piedmont areas and on ancient terraces. The ruins of stone buildings for the wintering grounds of Kazakhs from the 19th – early 20th centuries are found everywhere around rocks on extended areas of dry erosion valleys; ceramics of early and medieval nomads are also often found there. Typology and Dating. Ancient engravings occur on sandstone rocks covered with a black patina. The most significant concentration of petroglyphs (over 2,000) is located in a watershed in the middle part of the Moldazhar Gorge. The slopes and top of a large dome-shaped bald peak are interspersed with numerous fragments of sandstone of morainic origin. The most ancient Moldazhar petroglyphs date to the Bronze Age, but were, apparently, created at different periods, since several groups differ by style and content. The earliest ones depict wild horses with an overhanging mane as well as oxen and very rarely humans. Relatively few and concentrated on the southern slope of the mountain, they are attributed to the culture of early cattle-breeders and metal-makers from the first half of the 2nd millennium BC and are known in many Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan rock art sites. Their geographic range encompasses the southern and central regions of Saryarka as well as the Tarbagatay and Near Irtysh Area. The most numerous and remarkable series consists of Late Bronze Age petroglyphs, whose themes and style differ from those of earlier engravings. Horses also dominate, but the repertoire was enriched by skillfully carved figures of animals, birds, and humans. The best works of the period were created on the most convenient broad surfaces. A distinctive feature is the decorative manner of depicting horses: the body is filled with non-recurring combinations of straight lines and zigzags; several of these geometric motifs correlate with the ornamentation of Late Bronze Age ceramics in the south of Siberia and Kazakhstan. Humans stand out in the panels along with images of «marvelous» horses tamed or protected by humans from the attacks of predators. There are frequent images of single combats with warriors armed with bows, spears and clubs, and chariot battle scenes; many details of armor (forms of quivers and bows, arrowheads and spearheads) are depicted quite realistically, which permits comparisons with artifacts and dates them to the turn of the 2nd – 1st centuries BC. Close analogies exist with petroglyphs at Eshkiolmes in Eastern Semirechye, but, in general, this series of engravings at Moldazhar is unique. The Tarbagatay petroglyphs from the early 1st century BC show great similarity with Altai, Tuva, and Western Mongolia rock art. Isolated deer images, in the style of the Western Mongolian «deer» Rock Art Sites in Kazakhstan 39 stones in Moldazhar, are scattered on different slopes of the mountain and occupy secondary surfaces of rocks free from drawings from previous epochs. Almost similarly, the creators of petroglyphs in the Early Saki period, distinguished by the uniqueness of their animal style and a specific repertoire, had a limited choice. Images of wild animals – deer, wild boar, predators in traditional hunting and chasing scenes – supplement skillful engravings of horses with riders and a rare motif for petroglyphs: imprints of horse hooves; based on many analogies, these drawings date to the 8th-6th centuries BC. The medieval epoch is less distinctly

represented among the Moldazhar petroglyphs. No figures of mounted standard bearers, indicative of ancient Turkic rock art, are known, although there are tamgas such as those found from the early medieval period in the Altai, Western Mongolia and Semirechye. Some hunting scenes depicting dashing animals, executed in a unique ancient Turkic «animal» style, also date to the same period. A single combat scene of two warriors with long sabers can be dated to no earlier than the 10th century. Among the latest Moldazhar petroglyphs, numerous Kazakh tamgas are carved on different rocks with ancient drawings and are grouped in a specific order. All signs are similar in technique, size (2-4 cm) and paleography, and resemble tamgas reproduced on documents from the 18th-19th centuries. In three cases, three «sultan» tamgas are depicted together; six tamgas of a different type are carved together on another rock. They are attributed to lineage signs of Kazakhs from the Middle and Greater Zhuses. Dolankara Location. The Dolankara Mountains are located 115 km south-east of Ayaguz City, 70 km southwest of the district capital, Aksuat Village, in the Tarbagaray District of the Eastern Kazakhstan Region, in the south-western spurs of the Tarbagatay Range. Groups of petroglyph sites are predominantly at the mouths of several gorges on the left bank of the middle reaches of the Bugas River. Research Status and Documentation. The Dolankara Mountains petroglyphs were discovered by artist-regional ethnographer Sadykov S. and studied in 2008 by Rogozhinskiy A.-E. who drew up an archeological map of the area and carried out a selective documentation of the petroglyphs. Archeological Context. The area is classified as mid-hill terrain (1,010-1,070 m above sea level) and traditionally used by cattle-breeders as a place for wintering. Different groups of settlements, burial sites, irrigation structures, stelae, statues, petroglyphs and inscriptions are dated to the Neolithic, Bronze Age and early 20th century in a number of gorges. Cemeteries have the usual stelae with the tamgas of various Kazakh lineages from the Nayman tribe dated to the second half of the 18th - early 19th centuries. Typology and Dating. Petroglyphs from ancient periods are rare, but include some expressive images of Early Saki art related to the pictorial tradition of «deer» stones. The most diverse are petroglyphs of the early medieval period, found both on rocks that surround dwelling sites in the mountains and among ancient drawings in isolated locations. Engravings of a chimerical predator and a serpent-dragon overlap Bronze Age bulls. Medieval tamgas of several types are repeatedly drawn along with traditional hunting scenes near settlements. Tibetan, Oirat prayer inscriptions and various images dated to the middle of the 17th - first half of the 18th centuries make a special group. A panel with engravings depicting Oirat warriors /knights-at-arms and heavily armored riders date to the same period. Rock Art in Central Asia 40 Sites of Western Kazakhstan Western Kazakhstan includes four administrative Regions –Western Kazakhstan, Atyrau, Aktyube and Mangistau. This vast territory is an aggregation of high and low plains bounded only in the north and south-west by relatively small mountain formations. Rock art sites are known in the Mangyshlak Peninsula (Mangistau), Ustyurt Plateau and Mugodzhari Mountains that are southern spurs of the Ural Range. The total length of Mugodzhary from the north towards the south is 200 km, their median altitude is 450-500 m. The mountains mainly consist of magmatic, metamorphic, and occasionally pressed sedimentary rocks. Mugodzhary is classified as low-hill terrain and, in its southern

part, consists of low mountains and rolling hills that resemble the Saryarka terrain. Several rivers – the Emba, Irgiz, Or', Tobol, Taldy – originate there, but most dry out. The Ustyurt Plateau is a vast high plain (up to 370 m above sea level) with uniform leveled surfaces bounded by steep precipices up to 150m high. The plateau is structured by horizontally embedded marine deposits, limestone, and dolomites, where karst developed. Ustyurt is classified as an argillaceous desert with a sharply continental, extremely dry climate with an annual precipitation of 100-150 mm. The uniqueness of the Mangistau and Ustyurt natural environment influenced the development of rock art, particularly the almost non-existence of durable rocks as a substrate. Ancient images on soft limestone may only be preserved on closed-in natural surfaces or in a fossilized archeological condition (Koskuduk). The majority of rock drawings date to the late medieval period and modernity (16th – early 20th centuries). At the same time, the properties of the local rocks enabled the creation of excellent drawings filled with ethnographic details. Finally, the widespread use of rock surfaces in funerary and cultic structures for thematically-rich artistic creations also pertains to the specifics of rock art development in the region. The Most Important Sites in Western Kazakhstan Toleubulak Toleubulak Grotto is located near the Egindybulak Villages in the Shelkar District of the Aktyube Region, in the upper reaches of the Emba River, on the right bank of the Zhem River, on the southwestern end of the Mugodzhary Mountains. The site, discovered in 1999 by a Russian-Kazakh expedition led by Taymagambetova Zh.K., was studied in 2005 by Samashev Z. (Samashev 2006). The grotto of aeolian origin is located in the western part of a rock massif made of siliceous sandstone. It contains a significant quantity of petroglyphs on its floor. There is another cavity with petroglyphs 400 m northwards. Near the grotto under an overhang is also a group of pecked images of a camel and horse, and humans on a separate boulder 100 m westwards. The largest grotto with petroglyphs is the most interesting; its wide entrance opens to the south, its surface is 20m2 and it is up to 0.70 m at the highest part near the entrance. Practically, the entire floor is occupied by petroglyphs. The drawings are deeply carved into the surfaces; some figures are additionally abraded. There is one case of overlapping of figures, but, in general, the entire pictorial complex is homogeneous. Three zones approximately equal in area and with similar images have been identified from the top part of the surface inclined towards the entrance. The upper zone is covered with rows of carved sub-parallel lines sometimes intersected by crossing lines. The second group consists of often Rock Art Sites in Kazakhstan 41 open circles with lines inside. The second includes cup-holes that are up to 6cm deep and 17-25 cm in diameter. The second or middle zone comprises well-preserved phallic figures; there is also a large number of cup-holes there, mostly abraded. The third zone represents large images of a bean-shaped fruit or horse hooves. The drawings were incised then abraded. The specificity of the panel is the absence of human or animal images and the prevalence of linear-geometrics and cupholes. According to its topography and repertoire, the Toleubulak Grotto has no analogies in Central Asia, but researchers find it comparable to the Kamennaya Mogila grottos in the Northern Near Azov Area. Its images are tentatively attributed to the first half of the Holocene, no later than the Neolithic. Stone Age dwelling sites and other sites from different periods were discovered in the area. Koskuduk The site is located

7km from Aktau City on Caspian Sea riverside rocks, on the territory of settlements from the Late Neolithic called Koskuduk I. The site was discovered and explored in the course of archeological excavations at the dwelling site by Astafyev A.E. (Samashev 2006). Two snakes were engraved on a horizontal limestone surface within a Neolithic habitation site. The images are deeply carved and 1.5-2.0 cm wide; the snake heads are rounded cavities. One figure is 67cm long, while another one, in a worse statue of preservation, is 23cm long. Both snakes are depicted as crawling side by side. To the left of the large image, 8 aligned cup-holes are 3-3.5 cm in diameter. The images include grooves, two crawling snakes and, possibly, a fish 150 m south-east of cliffs near the sea. The snakes are 160 and 250 cm long; an extension near the head of one of them resembles a cobra's hood. Three artificial cavities were possibly meant to collect rainwater, 10m from the horizontal surface of the cliff; the capacity of the reservoirs is about 30 liters. The images were discovered in an archeological context, which permits dating them to the Neolithic, i.e. when the habitation site was used. Ustyurt and Mangistau petroglyphs Rock drawings were found in the Ustyurt and Mangistau cretaceous mountains (Akmaya, Ayrakty) on open surfaces and in caves of Zhygylgan Cape on the north-eastern shore of the Caspian Sea. They were carved on a soft cretaceous substrate. The location of most drawings in the Akmaya Mountains is related to traditional hunting trails and ambush places. They represent horses, camels, hunting scenes for wild animals (big-horn sheep, mountain goat, and cheetah) with the help of a primitive firearm, battle scenes, horse races, and others. Many of these engravings are carved with great mastery, but human images are sketchy, while the main emphasis was on depicting the belongings of a mounted warrior. Frequently, they are accompanied by Arabic inscriptions. From the accurately depicted realistic details (armor, horse harness, and a rider) and the epigraphy, most images are dated to the period of modernity (18th-19th centuries). Ethnographic graffiti on the walls of cultic and funerary sites – mausoleums, headstones, mosques, and others – are in a special category, specific to Ustyurt and Mangistau and widely spread there. Depending on the dating and location of the sites, those images can be attributed to Turkmen and Kazakh tribes. In the specific natural environment of Mangistau desert areas, that served as a habitat for various ethnic groups of relatively modern nomads, a special type of site with lineage signs-tamgas on rocks is known under the common name of «tamgalytas». As a rule, they are near wells or good Rock Art in Central Asia 42 pastures and are found in the Tyupkaragan Peninsula near Ustyurt Chink (Masat-Ata, Tanbalytas). Quite often, in addition to tamgas, there are images of animals, riders, and geometric signs. The signs of Turkmen and Kazakh tribes are predominant among these accumulations of tamgas. They are dated to the 17th-19th centuries, but some of them may belong to an earlier period.

Bibliography:

1. Ageeva E.I. 1961. On the Types of Ancient Burials of the Alma-Ata Region. Proceedings of the Institute of History, Archaeology and Ethnography, Academy of Sciences of the Kazakh SSR. – Alma-Ata. 1961. – Vol. 12: 21-40.

2. Adrianov A.V. 1916. Archaeology of the Western Altai Revisited (from a trip to the Semipalatinsk Region in 1911). Proceedings of the Imperial Archaeological Commission. Issue 62. Archeological Map of Kazakhstan 1960. – Alma-Ata.
3. Erofeev I.V. 2010. The History of Creation of the Cultic Complex Tamgalytas (1677-1771). The Role of Nomads in the Formation of the Cultural Heritage of Kazakhstan. Scientific Readings in Memory of Masanov N.E.: Proceedings of the Scientific and Practical Conference, – Almaty, – pp. 490-530.
4. Kadyrbaev M.K. & Maryashev A.N. 1997. Rock Drawings of the Karatau Range. – Alma-Ata. Kuznetsov L. 1927. On the Inscription on Stone «Tamgaly-Tas» in the Betpak-Dala Desert in the Atbasar county of the Akmola Province. Notes of Semipalatinsk subdivision of the West Siberian Division of the Russian Geographic Society. Issue 16: 122-124.
5. Margulan A.H. 1997. The World of a Kazakh. On the Meaning of Epigraphic Sites in Kazakhstan. – Almaty.
6. Margulan A.H. 2003. Essays. Vol. 3-4. Margulan A.K. & Ageeva E.I. 1948. Archaeological Work and Discoveries in the Territory of the Kazakh SSR. Proceedings of the Academy of Sciences of the Kazakh SSR. Archaeological Series. – Almaty. Issue 1: – pp. 129-135.
7. Maryashev AN. & Goryachev A.A. 2002. Rock Drawings of Semirechye. – Almaty.
8. Medoev A.G. 1979. Engravings on Rocks. Sary-Arka, Mangyshlak. Part 1. – Alma-Ata.
9. Novozhenov V.A. 2002. Petroglyphs of Sary-Arka. – Alma-Ata.
10. Rogozhinsky A.E. 2010. The History of Study and New Research Tamgalytas Cultic Complex on the River Ili (Ili Kapshagay). The Role of Nomads in the Formation of the Cultural Heritage of Kazakhstan. Scientific Readings in Memory of Masanov N.E.: Proceedings of the Scientific and Practical Conference, – Almaty. – pp. 474-489.
11. Rogozhinsky A.E., Aubekerov B.Zh., Sala R. 2004. Sites of Kazakhstan. Historical Rock Art in Central Asia. Public Participation, Management, Preservation, Documentation. – Almaty, – pp. 45- 92.
12. Samashev Z. 2006. Petroglyphs of Kazakhstan. Almaty. Spasskiy G.I. 1818. Antiquities of Siberia: On Ancient Siberian Paintings and Inscriptions. Siberian News Bulletin. – St. Petersburg. Part I.
13. Samashev Z., Kurmankulov Zh., Zhetybaev Zh., Lymer K. 2000. The petroglyphs of Terekty Aulie, Central Kazakhstan. International Newsletter on Rock Art (INORA) 25: 4-8.

Appendix II

Ohayon Isabelle, The Kazakh Famine: The Beginnings of Sedentarization, Online Encyclopedia of Mass Violence, [online], published on: 28 September, 2013, accessed 25/08/2016, http://www.sciencespo.fr/mass-violence-war-massacre-resistance/en/document/kazakh-famine-beginnings-sedentarization, ISSN 1961-9898

The Context

The famine that struck the Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic (ASSR) of Kazakhstan between 1930 and 1932 belongs to the wider history of collectivization in the USSR and, more specifically, the campaign to sedentarize the Kazakhs undertaken during the same period. This famine was among the deadliest in the USSR and directly led to the deaths of approximately one third of the Kazakh population, while also triggering the emigration of several hundred thousand survivors and the rapid and irreversible decline of the nomadic way of life of the inhabitants of the region's steppes. The Soviet census of 1926 estimated the population of the Kazakhstan ASSR at 6.2 million, with approximately four million Kazakhs and the remainder comprised of comprising European colonial populations and local minorities, including Russians, Ukrainians, and Poles. Seventy percent of the Kazakhs were nomadic livestock farmers who ranged throughout the arid, semi-arid, and steppe regions of this vast territory. The sedentary farming activities of other nationalities were concentrated in the richer, arable lands in the northern and southeastern (Alma-Ata) regions of the republic.

The acceleration of the effort to industrialize the USSR introduced by the first Five Year Plan in April 1929 at the 15th conference of the Communist Party were followed several months later by the collectivization of rural areas and its repressive corollary, dekulakization. The Kazakhstan ASSR played a key role in this program for two reasons:1) Its grain-producing lands, situated in northern regions near the Russian borders, were considered priorities for collectivization, and 2) It possessed «inhospitable» and sparsely populated regions to serve, as did the Urals and Siberia, as a «zone of special settlement» for «dekulakized» inhabitants.

At the local level, the end of the 1920sand the launching of collectivization corresponded to a policy of deliberate sedentarization that involved efforts to entice the more fragile nomadic populations to settle in kolkhozesin zones surrounding the steppes that were considered unsuitable for any kind of agricultural production. These new collective farms were theoretically intended to operate as part of an agro-pastoral economy, combining livestock raising and agriculture. This project, which was only very partially realized, constituted a central element of a cluster of measures taken to control and repress nomadic Kazakh society. These policies included a campaign to eliminate the national elites from political bodies and confiscate property belonging to bay (livestock owners) and deport them. The targets of these policies were the most charismatic and therefore influential figures of rural Kazakh society, and they were intended to allow the central powers to gain control over the Kazakhstan ASSR, which the government considered insufficiently

Sovietized in 1925 and to be still under the sway of clans and corrupt political practices.

Systematic requisitions of commodities such as grain and livestock that were a major feature of Soviet collectivization campaigns were organized within an extremely tense political climate. In 1929, these measures took effect after – and superseded-efforts to sedentarize nomadic herders that had began in 1927-1928. Kazakh nomadic farmers' herds, which totaled approximately 40.5 million head, were massively reduced between 1929 and 1932 (see chart in appendix) in order to supply urban areas. At the same time, wheat requisitions for the same period represented approximately one third of the republic's total grain production, reaching a peak of one million tons of wheat in 1930. The combined impact of forced livestock and grain collection was a major factor in the outbreak of famine.

These policies were initially greeted with a wave of resistance in 1929 on the part of the Kazakh pastoral population that varied according to region and lasted until 1931. Insurrectionist movements (and even guerrilla activities in the Mangyshlak region) evolved into episodic rioting involving several thousand people as organized protests flared across Kazakhstan during the early years of collectivization, but these movements gradually subsided as the famine became more severe.

Growing shortages later caused the protests to fail entirely, leading the herders of the steppes to flee in order to save their livestock in an initial wave of emigration. In 1930, 35,000 Kazakh households and their 900,000 head of livestock departed for China, Iran, and Afghanistan or clandestinely crossed the borders into the USSR. These departures intensified in 1931, coinciding with a peak in livestock requisitions (which reached a record rate of 68.5%of total available livestock), involving this time the mass of Kazakh nomads stripped of their means of livelihood and seeking any possible means of subsistence. According to data collected by the OGPU (USSR political police)in 1931, 1,700,000 Kazakhshad fled their native regions (Aldazhumanov, 1998: 84), and 600,000 had crossed Kazakh borders en route to China, Mongolia, Afghanistan, and Iran,as well as the Soviet Republics of Uzbekistan, Kirghizstan, Turkmenistan, Tajikistan, and Russiain search of sustenance and employment, (for example on new industrial construction sites in western Siberia).These internal and external migrations were linked totyphus, tuberculosis, and syphilis outbreaks that reached epidemic proportions and caused the deaths of approximately 30% of the population.

More than one million people perished from famine or during the mass exodus of several hundred thousand Kazakhs in 1932 (Ohayon, 2006: 264-268). While the authorities of the Republic of Kazakhstan were slow to react, the Kazakh leader and Vice-President of the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic (RSFSR), Turar Ryskulov, first officially sounded the alarmin a personal letter to Stalin (Ryskulov, 1997, t.3: 304-358;Werth, 2003). The letter prompted the first official recognition of the catastrophe and led to the adoption of a series of measures to curb the famine and repatriate Kazakhs who had left to escape its ravages. The primary role of these policies was to over see the return of 665,000 Kazakhs (otkochevniki or fleeing nomads) who were sometimes described as refugees. More broadly, this operation also entailed resettling the populations affected by the famine, whether exiled or not,

onto kolkhozes, most of them charged with raising livestock, an initiative bolstered by acquisitions of livestock in other countries. Because of the economic priorities of the first Five Year Plan, «technical agriculture» (cotton, tobacco, and sugar beet) and industry played a significant role in reinserting a segment of the Kazakh population mobilized to respond to the needs of favored new sectors of activity (Ohayon, 2006).

By the end of the collectivization process, two thirds of the Kazakh survivors of the famine were successfully sedentarized due to the 80% reduction of their herds, the impossibility of resuming pastoral activity in the immediate post-famine environment, and the repatriation and resettlement program undertaken by Soviet authorities.

The Leaders

Several levels of responsibility were involved in the unfolding of this episode of devastating famine between 1928 and 1932. In a general sense, it was Stalin's Soviet government that,by establishing a disproportionate plan for requisitioning livestock and food commodities, directly doomed Kazakh herders toa period of famine. It is nevertheless difficult to directly incriminate Stalin in person in this case, because no available sources, such as correspondence betweenStalinand the first secretary of the Kazakhstan Communist Party, Filipp Isaevich Goloshchekin, contain explicit instructions referring to the Kazakh population as such, which was the case during the three most critical months of the Ukrainian famine between November 1932 and January 1933 (Werth, 2008). Indeed, there is some question concerning what precisely was known about the actual events, as well as what was transmitted to the central powers, particularly in terms of the dwindling herds and the shrinking population of nomadic herders. Between 1930 and 1932, data about the population that were supplied to the Kazakh leadership of the Communist Party greatly underestimated the losses suffered (Pianciola, 2009: 468), partly due to the difficulty of collecting reliable data over the vast Kazakh territory, and partly due to deliberate denial of the scale of the catastrophe among Kazakh authorities. However, beginning in 1930 but particularly in 1931, Moscow received a number of warnings from the regional authorities of the Volga,western Siberia, and Uzbekistan complaining of the arrival of large numbers ofailing, famished Kazakhs who were causing disorder and criminality and propagating epidemics. These warnings remained unconfirmed by the first secretary of the Kazakh party, however.

Indeed, the attitude of the authorities of the Republic of Kazakhstan revealed a certain laisser-faire approach, particularly on the part of Goloshchekin. Beginning in 1930,the information departments of the OGPU andthe district-level and regional executive committees provided abundant reports of mass emigration and rising mortality among nomadic groups.In 1931, however, Goloshchekin declared, not without some cynicism:«TheKazakh, who has never once left his aoul[village], who did not know the roads except for those of his nomadic itineraries, now travels from one region to another in the interior of Kazakhstan, integrates himself into Russian and Ukrainian kolkhozes, changes employment, leaves to work on construction sites in the Volga or Siberia» (cited in Ryskulov, 1997, vol.3: 327). Although he did not express a deliberate intention to eliminate the Kazakh population, they nevertheless constituted a negligible factor in the party chief's discourse, and he often voiced

contempt for nomadic Kazakhsociety, whose «retardation» had been the target of his policies since 1925.

Local authorities' waiting game concerning the spread of the famine was contributed to by the general environment of chaos caused by the flight of the population, the dismantlement of agricultural production, popular political opposition, and the need to sustain industrialization efforts in Kazakhstan while also managing a swelling population of special settlers and displaced inhabitants. This deeply unsettled context led to a certain loss of control over the society, but also over the supply chain, housing, and other key factors. Under such extreme crisis conditions, tensions worsened in 1932 within the KazakhParty that ultimately led to formal denunciations of the catastrophe. The first outcry came from the president of the Council of the People's Commissars of Kazakhstan named by Goloshchekin, the Kazakh Uraz Isaev, in several letters addressed to Stalin. This was followed by other voices, such as the vice-president of the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic (RSFSR), the Kazakh Turar Ryskulov, between August and September of 1932. The leaden shroud over the matter was finally lifted, and recognition of the facts by central authorities, who were primarily concerned by the precarious economic situation,led to Goloshchekin's forced resignation. He was assigned responsibility, thereby removing blame from the central authorities and Goloshchekin's fellow officials.

The Victims

The famine that resulted from collectivization and the confiscation of agricultural commodities in Kazakhstan affected the rural population of the territory to varying degrees of severity. Nomadic Kazakh society paid the heaviest toll, however, primarily due to the the fragility of the economic basis of nomadic pastoralism when faced with significant losses of livestock. Unlike grain-based agriculture, the production cycle of herding was devastated by the disappearance of herders' resources and steep declines in grazing conditions for their remaining herds. Because these condition simpeded the reestablishment of the herds, pastoral populations became extremely vulnerable, as herders became totally dependent on the agricultural products of sedentarized farmers whose own production was largely confiscated by the government. Statistical reports of the actual number of victims of the famine vary depending on source and author, although this variation has never become a matter of true debate.In the population deficit recorded for the administrative territory of the Kazakhstan ASSR, it is also difficult to distinguish which deaths were related to emigration and to assess with any accuracy the mortality rate among those who crossed the republic's borders. Indeed, these estimates are highly problematic due to the co-occurrence of large waves of migration and periods of high mortality rates.

It has been firmly established, however, that between 1,150,000 and 1,420,000 Kazakhs succumbed to the famine during collectivization (it is widely agreed that these figures included a majority of elderly and children), while 600,000 definitively emigrated (Ohayon, 2006: 268). The Kazakh demographer Makash Tatimov, a pioneer concerning this question, offers several estimates of the mortality rates based on his analysis of the Soviet censuses of 1926, 1937, and 1939, and on the

reasonably credible hypothesis that the the Kazakh population was under-reported in the 1926 census due to deception and non-disclosure among certain categories of the population and to the geographical isolation of many nomad encampments. According to Tatimov's studies, the number of Kazakhs who died during collectivizationis either approximately 1,750,000 (Abylkhozhin, Kozybaev, Tatimov, 1989: 67) or 2,020,000 (Tatimov, 1989: 124), which he contends corresponds to about half of the Kazakh population. These figures include mortality due to famine and epidemics, as well as definitive departures from the Republic of Kazakhstan. On the whole, Tatimov's estimates agree with my own (Ohayon 2006: 267-268),as well as those of Niccolò Pianciola (2009: 463-466), which are based on archival records.

During this same time period, the other rural and farming populations in Kazakhstan also experienced astrong decline. Between the censuses of 1926 and 1937, the Ukrainian population of Kazakhstan fell from 859,396 to 549,859 individuals and the Uzbek population from 124,600 to 109,978, while other native minorities such as the Uighurs experienced similar losses (Abylkhozhin, Kozybaev, Tatimov, 1989: 67). Primarily due to famine and epidemics but also emigration, these figures represent between 12% and over 30% of each population and constitute, for these groups, a casualty rate that is roughly equivalent to that suffered by the Kazakhs.

The Witnesses

Because of the absence of a commemorative policy worthy of the name in Kazakhstan and the lack of mediatized testimony, it is difficult to assert that actual witnesses to the Kazakh famine constitute an operational source of information. Both local administrators and Soviet politicians and leaders and survivors would have been potential witnesses, but the rare reports by these two groups are very different in nature and status. Official sources only exist in concrete terms in the form of archival records. Documents containing the reports of government officials, whether directly involved or simple observers, are occasionally published in academic studies. Strangely, the archives of the Kazakh government often contain a greater number of observations by representatives of Soviet regions bordering Kazakhstan than they do by Kazakhs themselves. These voices, no matter how limited, provide a valuable resource for historians because they offer «warm» perceptions of the events. For example, there is testimony from officials of the Volga and western Siberia describing the arrival of starving groups of empty-handed Kazakhs wearing tattered clothing and seeking food and work. A number of these reports point out the absurdity of directives received from on ordering high regional administrators in order to organize the return of Kazakhs when there was little security for them in their native territory and above all no resources available to meet the needs of waves of refugees not yet qualified for refugee status. Other letters addressed to the central government from Siberia and Kirghizia revealed cases of cannibalism in some extreme cases. Among the far less frequent survivor accounts, Mukhamet Shayakhmetov's narrative, written and initially published in Russian in 2002 before appearing in English in 2007, corroborates this catastrophic portrait of the famine and the flight of Kazakh families, while insisting quite revealingly

on the total incomprehension of the victims of the deeper reasons behind their situation and the government's policies and objectives. Shayakhmetov's narrative also reveals the pernicious impact of this episode on social cohesion, codes of morality, and Kazakh societal values. There also exist lesser-known sources of testimony to Kazakh emigration, particularly to China and Turkey, but they remain practically inaccessible because of the languages in which they were recorded and their highly limited accessibility.

One extremely rare source of observationsof the famine and its ramifications by an outsider was the Swiss reporter Ella Maillart, who traveled through Soviet Central Asia and China in the early 1930s. Revealing her curiosity, and perhaps her naiveté or at least total ignorance about the policies behind the events, Maillart described Kazakh refugees' suffering during the repatriation campaign that was initiated in the fall of 1932:

«In every wagon carrying merchandise there were Kazakh families wearing rags. They killed time picking lice from each other. […] The train stops in the middle of a parched region. Packed alongside the railway are camels, cotton that is unloaded and weighed, piles of wheat in the open air. From the Kazakh wagons comes a muted hammering sound repeated the length of the train. Intrigued, I discover women pounding grain in mortars and making flour. The children ask to be lowered to the ground; they are wearing a quarter of a shirt on their shoulders and have scabs on their heads. A woman replaces her white turban, her only piece of clothing not in tatters, and I see her greasy hair and silver earrings. Her infant, clutching her dress and with skinny legs from which his boney knees protrude; his small behind is devoid of muscle, a small mass of rubbery, much-wrinkled skin. Where do they come from? Where are they going?» (Maillart, 2001: 287-289, translated from french by the author).

The Memory

In Kazakhstan, as in the other post-Soviet republics, public debate concerning Soviet repression first emerged during Perestroïka and extended into the 1990s, a period that signaled a decisive break with earlier policies with respect to past events. But in Kazakhstan, despite numerous studies of the famine and demographic losses published during this period (Abylkhozhin, 1989; Mikhailov, 1990), there was no corresponding increase in individual expression or public outcry regarding the crimes associated with the Soviet past. A variety of reasons explain this memorial lethargy on the part of the government and the Kazakh population as a whole.

First, the bearers of the memory of this story – the witnesses, the actors, the victims of the famine – traversed the Soviet century in obscurity by virtue of the ideological ban on discussing this tragic chapter in the collectivization campaign, but also due to the hiatus generated by the powerful phenomenon of acculturation, or even deculturation,after the death of a third of the nomadic population. Indeed, the social, economic, and cultural upheavals brought on by Sovietization and contributed to by the vulnerability of traditional Kazakh society ruptured society broke the bonds between generations.

Furthermore, because mortality was greatest greater among the elderly during collectivization, the traditional bearers of collective memory were unable to tell their

stories. Abruptly introduced into Soviet modernity – with its new forms of authority and its obsession with written records and bureaucracy--surviving elders no longer found conditions in which they could relate their experiences. Oral history had always served as the primary vector of historical memory in pastoral Kazakh society, in which the important moments of Kazakh history achieved status as historical events by being situated within heroic epics. Oral history or «orature,» the term used by RémyDorto describe the corpus of oral narratives (Dor, 1982) – was unable to function as the relay of the story of sedentarization/collectivization any more than has modern Kazakhliterature (Ohayon, 2006).

The fact that this episode has remained without even a specific name is symptomatic of this effacement of history. Only the historian Talas Omarbekov (1994 and 1997), who works on the mediatization of these memories, describes the Kazakh famine as the second «Aqtaban Šubryndy» (an expression that evokes the frantic flight and exhaustion of populations), explicitly establishing a parallel between two major tragedies in Kazakhs history: the devastating Zungharinvasion of the eighteenth century,and the 1930s famine. His audience is limited to the press and Kazakh-language literature, however,a rather small circle.

Until very recently, this atonal familial and collective memory did not encourage the government to implement a commemorative policy, a silence explained by weak social pressure but also by political choices and imperatives governing relations between Kazakhstan and Russia.

The Kazakh government has maintained a privileged relationship with Russia as a major economic and political partner within the Community of Independent States (CIS) and has sought to avoid disrupting the relationship by pointing a finger at Russia, the heir to central Soviet power, in the matter of the demographic losses of the Kazakhs, an accusation that furthermore could have led to the assimilation of Kazakhstan into Ukraine. Within the public sphere, however, intense commemorative activity surrounding the Ukrainian famine and the desire of the Ukrainian people and government for the international community to recognize the genocidal nature of the famine has motivated several initiatives. For example, the expression «Kazakhholodomor» (a Ukrainian term meaning extermination by hunger), far from the public eye or official speeches, continues to this day to be found in certain history textbooks and in the press (Gubaydulin, 2009). But from the point of view of civilian society, despite increasingly frequent public references to the famine, there exists no project of the stature scale of the Memorial Association in Russia, which has made considerable efforts to sustain collective memory since Perestroïkaby attempting to assess the number of victims of repression and collecting testimony.

Commemorative policies concerning the 1930s famine experienced a turning point on May 31, 2012,when the head of state dedicated a monument to the memory of the victims of the famine in the capital city Astana . Other commemorative stones dedicated to this episode were simultaneously erected in other large cities on May 31, a date that had been designated as «the memorial day for the victims of political repression» several years earlier. This initiative finally satisfied expectations that had been bitterly expressed on a sign in 1992 in front of one of the central parks of Almaty (Alma-Ata during Soviet era) that stated:«Here a monument will be erected

to the memory of the victims of the famine of 1931-1933.»While the memory of the famine is now accepted, and studying and teaching about it are officially encouraged, it nevertheless remains framed in public discourse within the wider context of Soviet repression and, to listen to President Nazarbaev, it should not be the object of the slightest politicization.

The many deportations to Gulags camps in Kazakh territory between 1930 and 1945 are considered linked to the famine in analyses of the aftermath of Stalin's totalitarian regime. This over-arching link informs the meaning attributed to the Alzhirmemorial in the Astana region, which is dedicated to the all Stalin-era repressions but was erected on the site of the first camp created for the wives of victims of the Great Terror. The Karlag Museum, which opened in 2010 in the administration building of the Gulagon the outskirts of the city of Karaganda, is framed within a similarly broad rhetoric of commemoration of Stalin-era repression. The work of commemoration as encouraged by public authorities thus tends to fold merge the famine into a broader set of repressive episodes, significantly attenuating the singularity of the famine itself.

Ultimately, the relative listlessness of Kazakh society concerning the past can be explained by an ambivalence relationship with nomadism, a vanished way of life that nevertheless remains at the center of Kazakh identity and group cohesion. This identification has become problematic in recent times with the emergence of new standards for collective self-representation of the new Kazakh nation,which prefers not to hark back to a pre-Soviet «lost paradise»and which embraces values that do not mesh well with a nomadic past that is perceived as backwards. Contemporary Kazakhs prefer to emphasize their modernity, pointing to two major attributes: The construction of a capital, Astana,which is modeled on Singapore, and their globalized lifestyle. The obliteration of the memory of the famine, and hence of sedentarization, is closely bound to this tendency to obscure the nomadic past, forever relegating it to the mists of theremote, folkloric past.

Interpreting and Describing the Facts

Although it was unintentional, the famine was the outcome of a political project of brutal transformation that paid little attention to its human costs.There has been no real discussion among historians about the status of the episode of mass violence represented by the Kazakh famine. There has been an observable willingness to favor higher estimates of famine-related deaths and to acknowledge the scope of the tragedy (Tatimov), but there are no disagreements overinterpretating the records and, among academics, there is a relative degree of consensus in terms of how these events are currently portrayed.

In the early 1990s, some Kazakh historians (Abylkhozhin, Tatimov) characterized the famine as «Goloshchekin's genocide,» attributing sole responsibility for this tragedy to the first secretary of the Communist Party of Kazakhstan and accentuating his contempt towards the people, whom perceived as backwards.Although unmentioned in the magnum opus of the history of Kazakhstan (IstorijaKazakhstana s drevnejshyhvremen do nashihdnej, 2010: 284 et sqq.), the genocide argument currently found in certain textbooks were to some extent an empty exercise becauseit was not based on the international legal definition of

genocide and did not go particularly far in terms of evidence. Instead, these arguments were consistent with the official Soviet contention that considered that the forced resignation of Goloshchekin and his replacement by Mirzojan reveal that the entire episode was the work of a single man. Although it has been demonstrated and acknowledged that as political leader, Goloshchekin played a key role in covering up the full extent of increases in mortality between 1930 and 1933, it remains there is scant evidence of a desire on the part of the government or particular individuals to exterminate the Kazakhs as a group, or even to identify compelling motives for such a deliberate strategy. Indeed, the Kazakh population never represented a political danger for the Soviet government, nor did the protest movement or secessionist leanings among the population at any time imperil Soviet territorial integrity (Ohayon, 2006: 365).

As a consequence, recent studies have distanced themselves from the genocide argument (Istorija Kazakhstana s drevnejshyh vremen do nashih dnej, 2010; Cameron, 2010: 19-22; Pianciola, 2009;Ohayon, 2006), while also raising a number of finergrained questions. For Niccolò Pianciola, «extermination»of the nomads did in fact take place, and the authorities' laisser-faire approach did arise through conscious decision-making. Although not among the objectives of the policies developed by the central government in Moscow, it was nonetheless the price that the Soviet leadership was willing to pay to reach their goals of transforming and gaining economic and political control over the Kazakh steppes. Pianciola also emphasizes the colonial dimension of the Kazakh government at the time, in a region with a large Slavic peasant population left over from imperial colonization, further reinforced by the predominance of civil servants of European origin who held strong anti-Kazakh prejudices within the local Soviet bureaucracy. Power relations between «national» Kazakhs and Europeans help to explainwhy the Europeans allowed the herders to bear the brunt of the fallout from forced collectivization. This ethnic and ethnicized-aspect of the famine has also been explored by Matthew Payne, who contends that the discrimination revealed by the European bureaucrats' administrative practices in Kazakhstan is powerfully explanatory (Payne, 2001: 76). More broadly, however, according to Pianciola's analysis, the pattern of discrimination was also symptomatic of the paradoxes of the Stalin government, which was seeking to construct the State based on policies that promoted nationalization and the nativization of the civil service, while at the same time attacking national groups. This policy oscillated between an administrative utopian ideal that simultaneously promoted territorial control, economic rationalization, and modernization, as well as Realpolitik, all of which were integral features of the first Five Year Plan, whose explicit priority was the exploitation and extraction of resources, whether natural or human.

Bibliography

1. ABYLHOZHIN, Zhulduzbek B. (Ed.), 1991, Istorija Kazakhstana: belyepjatna. Sbornik statej [History of Kazakhstan: The White Stains. An Anthology of Articles]. – Alma-Ata: Kazakhstan.

2. ABYLKHOZHIN, Zhulduzbek B., ALDAZHUMANOV, Kaydar S., KOZYBAEV, Manash K., 1992, Kollektivizacija v Kazakhstane: tragedijakrest' janstva [The collectivization of Kazakhstan: The Tragedy of the Peasantry]. – Alma-Ata: Bibliotekaistorika.
3. ABYLKHOZHIN, Zhulduzbek B., KOZYBAEV, Manash K., TATIMOV, Makash B., 1989, «Kazakhstanskaja tragedija» [The Tragedy of Kazakhstan], Voprosy istorii, n°7, – pp. 53-71.
4. ALDAZHUMANOV, Kaydar, 1998, «Krest'janskoe dvizhenie soprotivlenija» [The Peasant Opposition Movement], in Deportirovannye v Kazakhstan narody: vremja isud'by [Peoples Deported to Kazakhstan: Time and Destiny]. – Almaty: Arys, – Pp. 66-93.
5. ALEKSEENKO, Nikolay V., ALEKSEENKO, Aleksandr N., 1999, Naselenie Kazakhstana za 100 let (1897-1997) [The population of Kazakhstan in 100 years (1897-1997)]. – Ust'-Kamenogorsk: Vostochno-Kazakhstanskij Universitet.
6. CAMERON, Sarah I., 2010, The Hungry Steppe: Soviet Kazakhstan and the Kazakh Famine, 1921-1934, Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation: Yale University, New Haven, CT.
7. DOR, Rémy, 1982, Chants du toit du monde, Textes d'orature kirghize: Maisonneuve et Larose.
8. Golod v Kazakhskojstepi (pis'matrevogiiboli) [Famine in the Kazakh Steppes (Letters of Anguish and Pain)], 1991, – Almaty: Qazaq Universitetì.
9. GUBAYDULIN, Oleg, 2009, «Stepnoygolodomor» [Holodomorof the Steppes], Karavan, 9 January 2009.
10. Istorija Kazakhstana s drevnej shyh vremen do nashihdnej [History of Kazakhstan from Antiquity to the Present], 2010, T. 4. – Almaty: Atamura.
11. MAILLART, Ella, 2001 [1943], Des Monts célestes aux sables rouges: Payot. 1935, Turkestan Solo – One Woman's Expedition from the Tien Shan to the Kizil Kum, G.P. Putnam's sons,
12. MALYSHEVA, Mariya K., POZNANSKIJ, Vladimir S., 1999, Kazakhi bezhency ot goloda v Zapadnoj Sibiri (1931-1934) [The Kazakhs, Refugees from the Famine in Western Siberia (1931-1934)]. – Almaty: Ġylym.
13. MIKHAJLOV, Valeriy, 1996 [1990], Hronika velikogo dzhuta [Chronical of the Great Dzhut]. – Almaty: Zhalyn.
14. Nasil'stvennaja kollektivizacija i golod v Kazakhstane v 1931-1933 gg., sbornik dokumentov i materialov [Forced collectivization and the Famine in Kazakhstan in 1931-1933, a collection of documents and material], 1998. – Almaty: Fond XXI vek.
15. Novejshaja istorija Kazakhstana. Sbornik dokumentov i materialov (1917-1939) [The Contemporary History of Kazakhstan. Collection of documents and material (1917-1939)], 1998. – Vol. 1. – Almaty: Sanat.
16. OHAYON, Isabelle, 2004, «Du campement au village: sédentarisation et transformations de l'aoul Kazakh à la période Soviet», Cahiers d'Asie centrale, n°13-14, – Pp. 177-198.

17. OHAYON, Isabelle, 2006, La Sédentarisation des Kazakhs dans the USSR de Stalin. Collectivization et changement social (1928-1945): Maisonneuve et Larose.
18. OMARBEKOV, Talas O., 1994, Zobalang, – Almaty: Sanat.
19. OMARBEKOV, Talas O., 1997, 20-30 zhyldardaghy Qazaqstan qasìretì. – Almaty: Sanat.
20. PAYNE, Matthew J., 2011, «Seeing Like a Soviet State: Settlement of Nomadic Kazakhs, 1928-1934» in Golfo ALEXOPOULOS, Julie HESSLER, Kiril TOMOFF, Writing the Stalin Era. Sheila Fitzpatrick and Soviet Historiography. – New York: Palgrave Macmillan. – Pp. 59-86.
21. PIANCIOLA, Niccolò, 2004, «Famine in the steppe. The collectivization of agriculture and the Kazak herdsmen, 1928-1934», Cahiers du monde russe, vol. 45, n°1-2, – Pp. 137-192.
22. PIANCIOLA, Niccolò, 2009, Stalinismo di frontiera. Colonizzazione agricola, sterminiodeinomadi e costruzionestatale in Asia centrale (1905-1936). – Rome: Viella.
23. RYSKULOV, Turar R., 1997, Sobranie sochinenij v trekh tomah [Selected Works in Three Volumes]. – Almaty: Kazakhstan.
24. SHAYAKHMETOV, Mukhamet, 2007, The Silent Steppe. The Memoir of a Kazakh Nomad under Stalin. – New York: Rookery.
25. SYDYKOV, Erlan, 2010, Gonimyegolodom (Dokumenty o sud'be desyatkov tysyach kazahov, bezhavshih v Sibir' v nachale 30-h godov) [Pursued by Hunger (Documents on the fate of tens of thousands of Kazakhs fleeing to Siberia during the early 1930s]. – Semej: Alashtanu.
26. WERTH, Nicolas, 2003, «La famine au Kazakhstan 1931-1933. Le rapport à Staline du 9 mars 1933», Communisme, n°74-75, – Pp. 9-41.
27. WERTH, Nicolas, «The Great Ukrainian Famine of 1932-33,» Online Encyclopedia of Mass Violence, 2008, http://www.massviolence.org/The-1932-1933-Great-Famine-in-Ukraine (consulted on June 11, 2012).
28. WHEATCROFT, Stephen G., 1997, «Soviet statistics of nutrition and mortality during times of famine. 1917-1922 and 1931-1933», Cahiers du monde russe, vol. 38, n°4, – Pp. 525-538.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 3

Part I. KAZAKHSTAN LANDS INHABITANTS
IN EARLIEST PERIOD 6
1.1. The Stone Age archeological sites
on the territory of Kazakhstan 6
1.2. The Bronze Age Archeological Sites on the Present-Day
Kazakhstan territory 11
1.3. The Iron Age on the Kazakhstan territory 15
1.3.1. The Saka tribes on the Kazakhstan territory:
sources evidences 15
1.3.2. Emergence and evolution of nomadic pastoralism
in Eurasian Steppe 18

Part II. KAZAKHSTAN LANDS IN THE STRUCTURE
OF THE TURKIC KHAGANATES (VI-XII CC.) 25
2.1. The political history of the First Turk khaganate (551-630) 25
2.2. Kazakhstan lands under the Western Turk khagans
and its successors' power 30
2.3. Cultural heritage of the Turks 42
2.3.1. Religions and beliefs of ancient Turks 42
2.3.2. Ancient Turks written monuments 54

Part III. KAZAKHSTAN IN THE STRUCTURE
OF THE MONGOLIAN STATES (XIII-XV CC.)
AND POST-MONGOLIAN STATE UNIONS (XIV-XV CC.) 61
3.1. Central Asia before the Mongolian invasion 61
3.2. Kazakhstan in the structure of the ulus Juji and
Golden Horde (the XIII – the first half of the XV centuries) 75
3.3. South and South-Eastern Kazakhstan in the structure
of the Chagatai Khanate (XIII-XV cc.) 100
3.4. Post-Mongolian State unions
on the territory of Kazakhstan 115
3.4.1. Ak-Horde – the first state entity on the local ethnic basis
on the territory of Kazakhstan 115

3.4.2. Eastern Desht-i-Kipchak in the structure of the Nomadic Uzbeg State (Abulkhair Khanate) 1428-1468 118
3.4.3. Western Kazakhstan in the structure of the Nogay Horde 121
3.4.4. South-East Kazakhstan in the structure of the Moghulistan 126

Part IV. KAZAKH KHANATE AND FORMATION OF KAZAKH NATION EPOCH, THE MIDDLE OF THE XV – THE FIRST THIRD OF THE XVIII CENTURIES 135
4.1. Written sources on the Kazakh Khanate (the second half of the XV- the first third of XVIII centuries) 135
4.2. Formation and strengthening of the Kazakh khanate 1470-1500 139
4.3. Historiography of the problem «Formation of the Kazakh Nation» 142
4.4. The Kazakh khanate in the first half of the XVI century 146
4.5. Internal and external position of the Kazakh Khanate in the second half of the XVI - XVII cc. 149
4.6. Material and spiritual culture of Kazakh people in XVI-XVII centuries 155

Part V. KAZAKHSTAN LANDS IN THE STRUCTURE OF THE RUSSIAN EMPIRE, 1731-1917 165
5.1. Different approaches to the study of the nature, objectives and policies techniques of the Russian Empire in relation to the national borderlands 165
5.2. The process of Kazakh Zhuses integration to Russian Empire, 1731-1865 183

Part VI. KAZAKHSTAN IN THE STRUCTURE OF THE SOVIET UNION, 1917-1991 189
6.1. Kazakhstan in the pre-war time, 1917-1939 189
6.1.1. Building the Soviet model of the Nation and State structure in Kazakhstan 189
6.1.2. Soviet modernization of economic relations in Kazakhstan 203
6.1.3. Implementation of soviet cultural modernization project in Kazakhstan, 1920-1930 214
6.2. Kazakhstan during the Great Patriotic War, 1941-1945 and Post-War period, 1946-1953 221
6.2.1. Memory about the Great Patriotic War, 1941-1945 in the Contemporary post-Soviet states 221
6.2.2. The Soviet Massive Deportations to Kazakhstan 227
6.2.3. Kazakhstan in the post-war period, 1946-1953 237
6.3. Kazakhstan in the period of Khrushchev's reforms, 1953-1964 242

6.3.1 The development of virgin and fallow lands in Kazakhstan: Achievements and Challenges 241
6.3.2. The public life in Kazakhstan during Khrushchev's reforms 248
6.4. Kazakhstan in the Brezhnev era, 1964-1982 252
6.5. Kazakhstan in the Gorbachev era, 1964-1982 261

Bibliography 270

Appendix I 276

Appendix II 312

Educational issue

Kundakbayeva Zhanat Bekovna

THE HISTORY OF KAZAKHSTAN FROM THE EARLIEST PERIOD TO THE PRESENT TIME

VOLUME I
From the earliest period to 1991

Educational manual

Computer page makeup and
cover designer: *N. Bazarbaeva*

The website used for front-page
designing www.lintro.ru

IS No.10236
Signed for publishing 06.12.16. Format 60x84 1/16. Offset paper.
Digital printing. Volume 20,37 printer's sheet.
Edition 100. Order No.5646
Publishing house «Qazaq university»
Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, 71 Al-Farabi, 050040, Almaty

Printed in the printing office of the «Qazaq university» publishing house